DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 454 679 EC 308 483

ITLE	National Survey of Educational Support Provision to Students with Disabilities in Postsecondary Education Settings. A Technical Report June 2000.
INSTITUTION	National Center for the Study of Postsecondary Educational Supports, Honolulu, HI.
SPONS AGENCY	National Inst. on Disability and Rehabilitation Research (ED/OSERS), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE	2000-06-00
NOTE	144p.
CONTRACT	H133B980043
AVAILABLE FROM	National Center for the Study of Postsecondary Educational Supports (NCSPES), University of Hawai'i at Manoa, 1776 University Ave. UA 4-6, Honolulu, HI 96822 Tel: 808-956-3975; Web site: http://www.rrtc.hawaii.edu.
PUB TYPE	Numerical/Quantitative Data (110) -- Reports - Research (143) -- Tests/Questionnaires (160)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Academic Accommodations (Disabilities); Assistive Devices (for Disabled); *Career Counseling; *Counseling Services; Data Analysis; *Disabilities; Job Placement; National Surveys; Postsecondary Education; Program Design; *Student Personnel Services; Transportation; Vocational Evaluation
IDENTIFIERS	*Testing Accommodations (Disabilities)

ABSTRACT

This technical report provides an overview and profile of the provision of educational supports and accommodations to students with disabilities in postsecondary programs across the United States. It is based on an analysis of a national survey conducted by the National Center for the Study of Postsecondary Educational Supports at the University of Hawaii at Manoa. The sample includes 422 public disability support coordinators (DSCs) working in postsecondary institutions and 193 DSCs from private institutions. Of the sample, 246 DSCs were from two-year or less than two-year institutions and 369 were from four-year institutions. Findings from the survey indicate: (1) students with disabilities have reasonable access to personal counseling and supports in the majority of postsecondary institutions; (2) disability support programs were well prepared to offer testing accommodations; (3) career/vocational assessment and counseling was commonly offered on campuses; (4) job placement services were offered at more than 50 percent of institutions; (5) half of the institutions offered learning center laboratory services on a consistent basis; (6) less than 50 percent of institutions offered disability specific assessments or accessible transport on campus; (7) disability specific scholarships were not often offered; and (8) assistive technology evaluations were rarely offered. (CR)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 454 679

National Survey of Educational Support Provision to Students with Disabilities in Postsecondary Education Settings

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

A Technical Report
June 2000

University of Hawai`i at Manoa
National Center for the Study of Postsecondary Educational Supports (NCSPES)
A Rehabilitation Research & Training Center (RRTC)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

EC 306483

National Survey of Educational Support Provision to Students with Disabilities in Postsecondary Education Settings

Technical Report
June 2000

University of Hawai`i at Manoa
National Center for the Study of
Postsecondary Educational Supports (NCSPES)
A Rehabilitation Research & Training Center (RRTC)

National Survey of Educational Support Provision to Students with Disabilities in Postsecondary Education Settings

Technical Report

National Center for the Study of
Postsecondary Educational Supports (NCSPES)
A Rehabilitation Research & Training Center (RRTC)
University of Hawai'i at Manoa
1776 University Avenue UA 4-6
Honolulu, HI 96822

June 2000

This report is also available at www.rrtc.hawaii.edu

Research Team:
Robert A. Stodden, Ron James, Chuan Chang, Tom Harding

Editorial Assistance:
Karen Kahn, Teresa Whelley, Robert Gregory, Juana Tabali Weir

Preparation of this report was supported by grant #H133B980043 from the National Institute on Disability and Rehabilitation Research (NIDRR) within the U.S. Department of Education. The contents of this report do not necessarily reflect an official position of any sponsoring agency.

CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES / v

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY / vii
NATIONAL SURVEY OF EDUCATIONAL SUPPORT PROVISION TO STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES IN POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION SETTINGS / vii

INTRODUCTION / vii

KEY STUDY QUESTIONS / vii
Method / viii
Survey Content / viii
Survey Distribution / viii
Stratification of Postsecondary Education Programs by Type / ix

OVERVIEW OF SIGNIFICANT FINDINGS / ix
Provisions of Educational Supports and Accommodations (Type and Range) / ix
Issues of Concern for Disability Support Coordinators / x
Written Policy / xi
Advocacy / xi
Transfer of Educational Supports to Subsequent Workforce Settings / xii
Outreach Programs / xii
Summary / xii

RELATED REPORTS / xiii

INTRODUCTION / xv

SECTION I.
DESCRIPTION OF THE SURVEY SAMPLE / 1

A. Breakdown of Demographics by Postsecondary Education Programs / 1
   1. Identification of Institution by Type / 1
   2. Overall Demographic Description of Institution Type / 2
   3. Analysis of Data Regarding Institutional Type / 2
   4. Summary / 6
B. Breakdown of Demographics by Disability Support Coordinators (DSC) / 6
   1. Characteristics / 6
   2. Other Questions of Disability Support Coordinator Sample / 9
   3. Summary / 9

SECTION II.
FREQUENCY AND TYPES OF EDUCATIONAL SUPPORTS IN POSTSECONDARY PROGRAMS (QUESTION #1) / 11

A. Overall Picture of Frequency and Type of Educational Supports Offered / 11
B. Overview of Findings / 14

C. Breakdown by Institutional Type / 15
D. Public Versus Private Institutions: Breakout for Specific Items or Types of Supports / 16
E. Two-Year Versus Four-Year Institutions / 17
F. Student Enrollment / 17
G. Locale of Institution / 17
H. Competitiveness of Institution / 17

SECTION III.
STUDENT AND SUPPORT PROGRAM CHARACTERISTICS / 19
INTRODUCTION

A. Number of Students Requesting Supports/Services / 19
B. Average Percents of SWDs Receiving Supports and Services / 21
C. Percentage of Students by Disability Type / 21
D. Institutional Organization of Support Services / 24
E. Screening Services / 25
F. Distance Learning Access for Students Who are Deaf or Blind / 26
G. Facilitation of Student Linkages with Other Community Resources / 27
H. Negotiated Agreements and/or Interagency Agreements with Vocational Rehabilitation / 29
I. Faculty/Staff Aid in Working with SWDs / 29
J. Monitoring and Evaluating Quality and Effectiveness of Services for SWDs / 30
K. Transfer of Supports to Postgraduate Employment Settings / 32
L. Affect of Lack of Resources / 32
M. Complaints from External, Non-University Sources / 34
N. Written Policies / 35
O. Top Three Issues for Disability Support Coordinators (DSC) / 38

SECTION IV
SUMMARY / 39

APPENDIXES / 41
A. DEMOGRAPHICS / 41
B. METHODOLOGY / 43
Survey Instrument / 43
Survey Content / 43
Survey Distribution / 43
STRATIFICATION OF POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION PROGRAMS BY TYPE / 44
Sample and Response Rates / 44
SAMPLING AND NON-SAMPLING ERRORS / 45
Data Analysis System / 45
C. TABLES / 47
List of Tables / 47
Tables / 48-81

REFERENCES / 83

QUESTIONNAIRE: *SAMPLE SURVEY INSTRUMENT*

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE

1. Distribution of Public vs. Private Institutions by Student Enrollment for 1998-99 / 3
2. Distribution of Public and Private Institutions by Type of Locale in the Community Setting / 4
3. Distribution of Two-Year vs. Four-Year Institutions By Overall Student Enrollment Size (Small, Medium, and Large) / 5
4. Distribution of Two-Year and Four-Year Institutions by Type of Community Locale / 6
5. Number of Years in Present Position as a Disability Support Coordinator (DSC) in Postsecondary Education / 7
6. Number of Years DSCs Worked in Area of Student Services in Postsecondary Education / 8
7. Range of Disciplines or Fields in Which DSCs Received Training and Degree / 8
8. Highest Degree Earned by DSCs / 9
9. Frequency of Provision of Educational Supports (Percentages Based on 650 Respondents) / 12-13
10. Overall Frequency of Provision of Types of Educational Supports or Accommodations by Breakout of Institutional Type: (Public vs. Private, Two-Year vs. Four-Year, Overall Student Enrollment, Type of Locale, and Competitiveness) / 16
    Number of Students with a Disability Who Requested and Qualified to Receive Support Services / 21
11. Number of Students with a Disability Who Requested and Qualified to Receive Support Services / 20
12. Average Percentage of SWDs (As Compared with All SWDs Known to the Disability Support Office) Offered and Received Supports/Services During the Past Academic Year by Institutional Type / 21
13. Percentage of SWDs Receiving Support by Disability Type / 22-23
14. How is Your Institution Organized to Provide Reasonable Accommodations and Support on Services for SWDs? / 24
15. Frequency of Screening Service Offered by Institutional Type? / 25
16. Distance Learning Access by Institution Type for Deaf or Blind Students / 26
17. Facilitation of Students' Linkages with Other Community Resources / 27
18. Percentage of Outreach Programs Offered by Institutional Type / 28
19. Negotiated Agreements by Institutional Type / 29
20. Faculty/Staff Aid in Working with SWDs / 30
21. Monitoring and Evaluating Quality and Effectiveness of Services for SWDs / 31
22. Transfer of Supports to Postgraduate Employment Settings / 32
23. Lack of Funding / 33
24. Lack of Specialized Staff / 34
25. Complaints from External, Non-University Sources / 35
26. Written Policy / 36-37
27. Top Three Issues / 38

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

National Survey of Educational Support Provision to Students With Disabilities in Postsecondary Education Settings

Introduction

Legislation such as the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) and the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) has settled many significant issues but also has raised numerous questions regarding access, support, and accommodations for students with disabilities (SWDs) in postsecondary educational institutions. These institutions are required by law to provide educational supports and reasonable accommodations to SWDs to ensure equal access to educational opportunities. However, the current practice of providing educational supports/services and accommodations for SWDs within postsecondary educational institutions has yet to be described, studied, analyzed, and defined. Thus an opportunity presents itself for research within an area of study that could profoundly impact the quality of life of persons with disabilities.

This Executive Summary provides an overview of the current status of educational supports and accommodations offered in postsecondary programs across the United States. It is based on an analysis of a national survey conducted by the National Center for the Study of Postsecondary Educational Supports (NCSPES) at the University of Hawai`i at Manoa. This profile provides a baseline of data regarding the provision of educational supports and accommodations to SWDs in postsecondary educational settings.

This document also contributes to one of four priority areas identified in Phase I of the Strategic Program of Research being conducted within the RRTC on Postsecondary Educational Supports. The four areas of investigation are: 1) the nature and range of supports in postsecondary programs; 2) the contribution of technology advances and their impact; 3) the effectiveness of supports; and 4) carry over of educational supports to subsequent employment settings. It is assumed that investigation within these areas will lay the groundwork for understanding the provision of postsecondary educational supports as offered to SWDs. Overall, the Center applied a variety of methods to the study of this question, with one method being a national survey of disability support coordinators. Researchers developed a survey around the following key study questions as delineated within the Strategic Program of Research:

Key Study Questions

1. What educational supports are offered to SWDs in a range of different types of postsecondary educational settings? What is the nature and range of these supports?
2. How does the type and range of educational supports offered within postsecondary educational settings correspond to the type and level of student disabilities?
3. What technical supports and assistive devices are available to SWDs in postsecondary educational settings? How do students use and benefit from such technology and related services?

4. Do educational supports transfer from postsecondary educational settings to subsequent workforce settings or employment?

Method

A survey instrument was developed and distributed to a national sample of more than 1500 disability support coordinators (DSCs), working in postsecondary institutions. The survey was voluntary, and individual responses were treated with strict confidentiality. For a further description of survey distribution, sample response rates, and data analysis, please see the methodology section of this report. Respondents were informed that their participation in the survey could have an impact on future national policy and practice as the report would be circulated to researchers and policy makers nationally.

The survey yielded a 45% response rate, with more than 650 respondents completing the full survey, equating a profile of educational support offerings across the nation. The respondents making up the sample were profiled as follows: 422 were from public educational institutions vs. 193 from private institutions; 246 were from two-year or less than two-year institutions vs. 369 from four-year institutions; and, 465 were members of the Association on Higher Education and Disabilities (AHEAD).

Survey Content

A working group of consortium members (each member providing their own expertise) developed the survey questions. A pilot study was conducted in the state of Hawai`i to field-test and provide feedback regarding question content and clarification, including suggestions for adding and removing items. From the pilot study feedback an 8-page survey was further developed around clusters of the following topics:

- Institution's capacity to offer specific supports or accommodations
- Number of students who receive specific supports by disability type
- Availability of assistive technology supports
- Outreach program offerings
- Funding and specialized staff issues that affect SWD's
- Written policies
- Information about the respondent

Survey Distribution

Two methods were used to select institutions that would receive the surveys. The first method involved distribution of the survey instrument to members of the professional AHEAD organization. The AHEAD membership list is composed of disability supports personnel in public and private two-year and four-year institutions across the United States.

To address sample bias that might be attributed to AHEAD member institutions, a second institution list of non-AHEAD participants was generated from a randomized, regionally stratified list of institutions representative of less than two-year, two-year, four-year and professional institutions, within both the public and private sectors.

Stratification of Postsecondary Education Programs by Type

The list of non-AHEAD postsecondary educational institutions was randomly selected from the 1995 Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS) CD ROM database, as maintained by the National Center for Educational Statistics (NCES), at the U.S. Department of Education. The IPEDS includes data on some 3,000 primary providers (institutions) of postsecondary education. It is the primary postsecondary education data collection program of the U.S. Department of Education used to meet its mandate to report national statistics on the condition of postsecondary education in the United States. It is a single, comprehensive data collection system encompassing all institutions and organizations whose primary mission is to provide postsecondary education. The IPEDS system is structured to collect institution-level data in such areas as enrollment, program completion, faculty and staff, and financing.

The IPED data set was divided into eight geographic regions and three sectors (public, private non-profit, and private for-profit). A random selection process ensured that each sector was equally weighted with respect to each type of program in any given region. After postsecondary programs were selected within the IPED, a sample of minority status institutions were selected and included within the sample list to ensure inclusive participation within the survey (e.g., 15 historically black institutions and 15 Native American institutions).

Overview Of Significant Findings

Provisions of Educational Supports and Accommodations (Type and Range)

Postsecondary education institutions are expected to provide supports, services, and accommodations that meet the needs of SWD's to learn and progress within their educational programs. Primary study questions of the survey concerned the types and range of supports/services and accommodations offered to SWDs.

Following is an overview of significant findings:

1. SWDs have reasonable access to personal counseling and supports in the majority of postsecondary institutions.
2. Disability support programs were well prepared to offer testing accommodations to SWDs.
3. Career/vocational assessment and counseling was commonly offered on postsecondary campuses.
4. Job placement services were offered to SWDs at more than 50% of the responding institutions.
5. Half of the responding institutions offered learning center laboratory services to SWDs on a consistent basis.
6. Less than 50% of institutions offered disability specific assessment/evaluations.
7. Less than 50% of the institutions offered accessible transport on campus.
8. Disability specific scholarships were not often offered to SWDs on postsecondary campuses.

9. Supports to study abroad were rarely offered to SWDs.
10. Real-time captioning of educational materials was rarely offered on postsecondary campuses.
11. Assistive Technology (AT) evaluations were rarely offered to SWDs on postsecondary campuses.
12. Most postsecondary education institutions did not offer facilitation or assistance with the transfer of supports to subsequent work settings.

When comparing two-year and four-year postsecondary institutions, and public-private institutions, public were more likely than private to offer a service or accommodation for SWDs. Two-year institutions were *more likely* than four-year postsecondary institutions to provide a service or accommodation to SWDs.

When comparing support offerings within two-year and four-year institutions, two-year institutions offered more support in most areas surveyed. Support areas such as a learning center laboratory, developmental/remedial instruction, equipment or software provision, skills training on equipment/software, and assistive technology supports across campus were offered more often at two-year institutions. Moreover, two-year institutions were better connected with the community through outreach programs with business/employers, federal programs, parent/family organizations, and consumer advocacy groups.

Disability support personnel in postsecondary institutions typically did not collect information or gather feedback from students on the quality of their services or supports. Approximately one-half of the responding public institutions did not offer assistive technology evaluations; this figure rises to 76% for postsecondary institutions in the private sector.

When offering assistive technology supports, postsecondary institutions in the private sector were less likely to offer distance-learning access for students, impacting negatively, for example, on the participation of students who were deaf and/or blind. Supports such as accessible on-line student services, TV courses, and Web-based courseware were not yet commonly available in any type of institution. Assistive technology supports were offered at very different rates in public versus private postsecondary institutions. For example, regarding assistive technology supports provided across campus (e.g. library, computer lab), 87% of public postsecondary institutions offered such support, compared to 56% of the respondents in the private sector.

Issues of Concern for Disability Support Coordinators

Survey participants were asked to rank the top 3 of 9 possible issues that they felt would be of concern for their unit over the next 2 to 3 years. The listing included the following:

- Funding
- Commitment of top administrators
- Faculty support
- Technology
- Number of professional staff available

- Availability of staff with specialized training
- Physical accessibility
- Compliance with Federal requirements
- Other

Four-year institutions ranked the top 3 issues they expected to face as funding, technology, and commitment of top administrators, respectfully. Two-year programs ranked funding, technology, and availability of staff with specialized training, respectfully as their top 3 issues.

Across all respondents, 66% believed that the lack of funding affected their unit's ability to serve SWDs. Other questions on the survey receiving weak or negative responses might also be attributed to lack of funds. For example, in areas such as scholarships, only 22% of the postsecondary institutions surveyed offered disability-specific scholarships; similarly, only 23% offered supports for study abroad. Both of these items were fiscally linked, and were items that affected an institution's ability to support the needs of SWDs. Thus, funding often becomes an over-riding concern for most providers of disability support services in postsecondary education.

Written Policy

Most responding postsecondary institutions made available written policy documents to SWDs on their campus. These documents described their institutional commitment to provide reasonable accommodations and confidentiality, as well as grievance procedures should an SWD wish to make a complaint. However, concerning several critical areas for SWDs, many responding institutions performed poorly. Few institutions indicated they had written policies in place related to: procedures for modification of admission requirements for SWDs (73% said no), definition of full-time status for SWDs (68% said no), or course waivers/substitutions (54% said no). Moreover, 50% of the institutions surveyed had no written policy regarding technology access referrals. In general, public postsecondary institutions had a greater number of written policies available, concerning the above issues, than did private institutions.

Four-year institutions were more likely than two-year institutions to have written policies available regarding the following areas: process for students to declare a disability and request accommodations, and definition of full-time status for SWDs. Two-year postsecondary institutions were more likely to have written policies on access to technology than four-year postsecondary institutions.

Advocacy

SWDs on postsecondary education programs have often indicated the need for advocacy support on campus. One of the most striking findings of the survey was that only 1 in 4 responding postsecondary institutions offered an advocacy organization on campus for SWDs, and of those that provided such support, only 25% offered the organization any financial, advisory, or other means of support. SWDs often indicated such services were very important to their success in postsecondary education.

Transfer of Educational Supports to Subsequent Workforce Settings

As students exit their postsecondary program the transfer of educational supports to work settings become important. One question of the survey addressed the carry over of supports and related services from the educational setting to the workplace. Of the postsecondary institutions surveyed, 61% offered career/vocational assessment and counseling services, and 46% offered job placement services. Approximately 25% of the responding postsecondary programs had specifically designated personnel to facilitate transfer of supports to subsequent work settings. Few respondents could offer specific information regarding what those services or supports were and/or if they were effective.

Outreach Programs

Beyond providing educational supports and services to address the needs of SWDs on campus, postsecondary institutions are also expected to facilitate student's linkages with off-campus agencies and community resources. One of the survey's questions asked whether institutions had reached out to other agencies and community resources that could provide support for SWDs, and if so, what resources had they accessed.

Most postsecondary programs (75%) facilitated student linkages with other community agencies, which provided related resources (such as vocational rehabilitation services). Approximately one-half of the responding postsecondary programs established and maintained connections with the following community resources:

- Federal programs providing supports for educational employment in the community (63.5%)
- Business/employers (67.5%)
- Parent/family organizations (54.3%)
- Consumers/advocacy groups (59.8%)

Public institutions facilitated student linkages with community resources more often than private institutions, and public two-year institutions had established and maintained more community and agency outreach activity than public four-year institutions.

Summary

Educational supports and accommodations for SWDs in postsecondary programs across the United States are well developed in the following areas: access to personal counseling and support, provision of testing accommodations, career/vocational assessment and counseling, and job placement services. Support offerings are tenuous in the following areas: disability specific assessment and evaluation services, accessible transport on campus, and the provision of disability specific scholarships. Further, postsecondary institutions rarely offer assistance with the transfer of supports from educational settings to the workplace, assistive technology evaluations, or study abroad options for SWDs.

It was further determined that education support offerings are highly dependent upon appropriate funding availability, specialized staff, and perceptions of the role of technological supports in the education of SWDs. With additional funding, there are several areas in which gains could be made, such as private foundations supports for scholarships specifically targeted assistive technology support, and accessible transport on campus.

Related Reports

Data analyzed as a part of this study complements two other reports published by the National Center on Educational Statistics (NCES). NCES is the primary federal entity for collecting, analyzing, and reporting data related to education in the United States. Their two recent reports, *Students with Disabilities in Postsecondary Education: A Profile of Preparation, Participation, and Outcomes* (June 1999); and *An Institutional Perspective on Students with Disabilities in Postsecondary Education* (August 1999), provide data as reported to a federal agency on students with disabilities from two-year and four-year postsecondary education institutions.

The **June** report provides information in the following areas:

1. The representation of SWDs in postsecondary education.
2. Who, among high school SWDs, gains access to postsecondary education?
3. Among those who enroll in postsecondary education, how well do they persist to degree attainment?
4. Among college graduates, what are the early labor market outcomes and graduate school enrollment rates of SWDs?

The **August** report provides information in the following areas:

1. Enrollments of postsecondary SWDs.
2. Institutions enrolling SWDs.
3. Support services and accommodations designed for SWDs.
4. Education materials and activities designed to assist faculty and staff in working with SWDs.
5. Institutional records and reporting about SWDs.

The August NCES study and the NCSPES study both examine enrollments of postsecondary SWDs and the offering of supports, services, and accommodations for SWDs. However, there are two major differences between these reports that are worthy of mention:

1. The reported study conducted by NCSPES provides a baseline of supports and accommodations offered to SWDs based upon a randomized, stratified, representative sample of institutions across the nation.
2. Respondents within the NCSPES study were assured of their institution's anonymity in an effort to alleviate any unstated pressure or concern that may arise when reporting data to a federal agency.

INTRODUCTION

Legislation such as the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) and the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) has increased accessibility to postsecondary education for students with disabilities (SWDs). By 1998, the full range of SWDs (i.e., part-time students and students enrolled in graduate programs) had risen to 10.5% of the postsecondary population (Gajar, 1998). In their recently released report, the National Council on Disability (2000) revealed that as many as 17% of all students attending higher education programs in the United States are now identified as having a disability.

The increasing numbers of SWDs has prompted numerous questions regarding access, supports, services, and accommodations as offered within postsecondary education institutions. Postsecondary institutions are required by law to provide educational supports and reasonable accommodations to SWDs to ensure equal access to educational opportunities. However, very little is known about the current practice of providing educational supports/services and accommodations to SWDs in postsecondary educational institutions. This technical report provides an overview or profile of the provision of educational supports and accommodations to SWDs in postsecondary programs across the United States. It is based on an analysis of a national survey conducted by the National Center for the Study of Postsecondary Educational Supports (NCSPES) at the University of Hawai'i at Manoa. The structure and content of survey questions were developed to address the following research questions:

1. What are the types and frequency of educational supports offered to SWDs in a range of postsecondary educational settings?
2. How does the type and range of educational supports offered within postsecondary educational settings correspond to the type and level of students' disabilities?
3. What technical supports and assistive devices are available to SWDs in postsecondary educational settings, and how do students use and benefit from such technology and related services?
4. Do educational supports transfer from postsecondary educational settings to subsequent workforce settings or employment?

A summary description of the method applied to this survey is provided in the preceding *Executive Summary*. A detailed description of the methodology applied to this study is provided as Appendix B. A copy of the survey used in this study can be found at the end of this technical report as QUESTIONNAIRE: *SAMPLE SURVEY INSTRUMENT.*

SECTION I

DESCRIPTION OF THE SURVEY SAMPLE

Section I addresses data collected in the latter portion of the survey and focused upon demographic information regarding the participating institutions responses to the survey. Section I provides a breakdown of the demographics of the survey sample data, which consisted of approximately 1-1/2 pages of questions.

Topics of investigation in Section I include various institutional characteristics, such as distribution of postsecondary institution locale within the community setting, public versus private institutional status, two-year versus four-year institutional status, and overall student enrollment within the institution. Further, a description of the Disability Support Coordinators (DSCs) who responded to the survey is included. These categories of question were established so the research team could examine the distribution of institutional types and compare variables such as, public with private, and two-year with four-year institutions, to see how they might differ when offering supports to SWDs. Further, researchers wanted to determine which types of institution SWDs enrolled in more often, and examine any trends that may exist between the public/private and two-/four-year institutions when offering supports for SWDs.

As was mentioned in the Executive Summary, an 8-page survey* was developed around clusters of the following topics:

- Institution's capacity to offer specific types of supports or accommodations
- Number of students who receive specific support by disability type
- Availability of assistive technologically
- Outreach programs
- Funding and specialized staff issues that affect SWDs
- Written policies
- Information about the respondent

A. Breakdown of Demographics by Postsecondary Education Programs

1. **Identification of Institution by Type:** The questionnaire asked respondents to identify their institution by type in the following areas:

    - *Public or Private,*
    - *Two-year or four-year,*
    - *Overall Student enrollment*
        - Small: less than 3,000
        - Medium: 3,000-9,999
        - Large: 10,000 or more

- *Competitiveness of admission standards:*
  - Few admission restrictions or requirements
  - Moderately demanding
  - Among the more demanding
  - Very demanding

- *Type of locale of institution:*
  - Urban
  - Suburban
  - Rural or small town

2. **Overall Demographic Description of Postsecondary Institution Type:** When profiling the 650 postsecondary institutional respondents, the following types of institutions responded (remainder were considered missing data for that specific section of the survey).

   - *615 respondents were profiled as public or private institutions and two-year or four-year institutions as follows:*
     - Public -422
     - Private-193
     - Two-year-246
     - Four-year-369

   - *604 respondents were profiled by size (overall student enrollment) as follows:*
     - Small-276
     - Medium-181
     - Large-147

   - *619 respondents were profiled by type of locale as follows:*
     - Urban-197
     - Suburban-171
     - Rural or small town-251

   - *621 respondents were profiled by competitiveness of admission standards as follows:*
     - Few restrictions-288
     - Moderately demanding-192
     - Among more demanding-95
     - Very demanding-46

3. **Analysis of Data Regarding Institutional Type:** The following tables provide a breakdown of data concerning postsecondary institutional types, as each responded to the survey. The focus of this analysis was upon a comparison of public and private institutions and two-year and four-year institutions, regarding institutional size based on overall student enrollment, and the type of locale of the institution.

TABLE 1. Distribution of Public vs. Private Institutions by Overall Student Enrollment Size for 1998-99

Institutional Type			Public vs. Private		Total
			Public	Private	
Overall Student Enrollment for 1998-1999	Small	Count	134	142	276
		% Within Student Enrollment for 1998-1999	48.6%	51.4%	100.0%
		% Within Public vs. Private	32.3%	75.1%	45.7%
		% of Total	22.2%	23.5%	45.7%
	Medium	Count	144	37	181
		% Within Student Enrollment for 1998-1999	79.6%	20.4%	100.0%
		% Within public vs. private	34.7%	19.6%	30.0%
		% of Total	23.8%	6.1%	30.0%
	Large	Count	137	10	147
		% Within Student Enrollment for 1998-1999	93.2%	6.8%	100.0%
		% Within Public vs. Private	33.0%	5.3%	24.3%
		% of Total	22.7%	1.7%	24.3%
Total		Count	415	189	604
		% Within Student Enrollment for 1998-1999	68.7%	31.3%	100.0%
		% Within Public vs. Private	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
		% of Total	68.7%	31.3%	100.0%

Discussion: 415 of the respondents were public institutions, 189 were private institutions. 68.7% of the respondents were public postsecondary institutions and 31.32% were private institutions. Large and medium size institutions were mostly public, and small institutions were about equally public and private. Public institutions were equally distributed across enrollment size (small= 32.3%, medium= 34.7%, and large= 33%) whereas small institutions account for 75% of the responding private institutions.

TABLE 2. Distribution of Public and Private Institutions by Type of Locale in the Community Setting

Institutional Type			Public vs. Private		Total
			Public	Private	
Locale	Urban	Count	124	72	196
		% Within Locale	63.3%	36.7%	100.0%
		% Within Public vs. Private	29.4%	37.5%	31.9%
		% of Total	20.2%	11.7%	31.9%
	Suburban	Count	111	60	171
		% Within Locale	64.9%	35.1%	100.0%
		% Within Public vs. Private	26.3%	31.3%	27.9%
		% of Total	18.1%	9.8%	27.9%
	Rural or Small Town	Count	187	60	247
		% Within Locale	75.7%	24.3%	100.0%
		% Within Public vs. Private	44.3%	31.3%	40.2%
		% of Total	30.5%	9.8%	40.2%
Total		Count	422	192	614
		% Within Locale	68.7%	31.3%	100.0%
		% Within Public vs. Private	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
		% of Total	68.7%	31.3%	100.0%

Discussion: 422 of respondents were public institutions, 192 were private institutions. 196 were in urban areas, 171 suburban, and 247 in rural areas or small towns. Of the public institutions, 29.4% were urban, 26.3% were suburban, and the largest sector, 44.3%, were rural or small-town institutions. Private institutions were more evenly distributed with 37.5% in urban areas, 31.3% suburban, and 31.3 % in rural or small-town locations.

TABLE 3. Distribution of Two-Year vs. Four-Year Institutions By Overall Student Enrollment Size (Small, Medium, and Large)

Institutional Type			Two-year vs. Four-year		Total
			Two-year	Four-year	
Student Enrollment for 1998-1999	Small	Count	113	163	276
		% Within Student Enrollment for 1998-1999	40.9%	59.1%	100.0%
		% Within Two-yr vs. Four-yr	47.1%	44.8%	45.7%
		% of Total	18.7%	27.0%	45.7%
	Medium	Count	76	105	181
		% Within Student Enrollment for 1998-1999	42.0%	58.0%	100.0%
		% Within Two-yr vs. Four-yr	31.7%	28.8%	30.0%
		% of Total	12.6%	17.4%	30.0%
	Large	Count	51	96	147
		% Within Student Enrollment for 1998-1999	34.7%	65.3%	100.0%
		% Within Two-yr vs. Four-yr	21.3%	26.4%	24.3%
		% of Total	8.4%	15.9%	24.3%
Total		Count	240	364	604
		% Within Student Enrollment for 1998-1999	39.7%	60.3%	100.0%
		% Within Two-year vs. Four-year	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
		% of Total	39.7%	60.3%	100.0%

Discussion: 240 of respondents were two-year institutions, 364 were four-year institutions. 39.7% of the respondents from two-year institutions and 60.3% were four-year institutions. 276 were small, 181 were medium, and 147 were large. Of the two-year institutions, 47% were small, 31.7% were medium, and 21.3% were large institutions. Of the four-year institutions, 44.8% were small, 28.8% were medium, and 26.4% were large institutions. Four-year institutions account for 65.3% of large institutions.

TABLE 4. Distribution of Two-Year and Four-Year Institutions by Type of Community Locale

			Two-year vs. Four-year		Total
			Two-year	Four-year	
Locale	Urban	Count	61	135	196
		% Within Locale	31.1%	68.9%	100.0%
		% Within Two-year vs. Four-year	24.8%	36.7%	31.9%
		% of Total	9.9%	22.0%	31.9%
	Suburban	Count	68	103	171
		% Within Locale	39.8%	60.2%	100.0%
		% Within Two-year vs. Four-year	27.6%	28.0%	27.9%
		% of Total	11.1%	16.8%	27.9%
	Rural or Small Town	Count	117	130	247
		% Within Locale	47.4%	52.6%	100.0%
		% Within Two-year vs. Four-year	47.6%	35.3%	40.2%
		% of Total	19.1%	21.2%	40.2%
Total		Count	246	368	614
		% Within Locale	40.1%	59.9%	100.0%
		% Within Two-year vs. Four-year	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
		% of Total	40.1%	59.9%	100.0%

Discussion: 246 of respondents were at two-year institutions, 368 were at four-year institutions. Of the two-year institutions, 24.8% were in urban locations, 27.6% suburban, and the largest sector, 47.6%, in rural areas or small towns. Of the four-year institutions, 36.7% were in urban areas, 28% suburban, and 35.3% in rural areas or small towns.

4. **Summary:** The largest sector of institutions responding to the survey can be profiled as small, public, four-year schools, located in a small town/rural area with few admission restrictions. The smallest sector of respondents was profiled as private, two-year, large suburban institutions with moderately demanding admission standards.

B. Breakdown of Demographics for Responding Disability Support Coordinators (DSC)

1. **Characteristics**: A portion of the survey sought to learn about the personal and professional characteristics of DSCs as found in a range of different types of postsecondary educational institutions. Questions asked were as follows:

   a) How many years have you worked in your present position?

b) *How many years have you worked in the area of student services in a postsecondary program?*

c) *In what discipline or field did you receive your training?*

d) *What is your highest degree earned?*

The following tables provide a breakdown of responses to the above questions.

TABLE 5. Number of Years in Present Position as a Disability Support Coordinator (DSC) in Postsecondary Education

		Frequency	*Percent	**Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Less Than 5 years	301	46.3	48.2	48.2
	Five to Ten years	169	26.0	27.0	75.2
	More Than Ten years	155	23.8	24.8	100.0
	Total	625	96.2	100.0	
Missing	.00	25	3.8		
Total		650	100.0		

Discussion: Almost one-half of the respondents (48.7%) in disability support roles in postsecondary education had been in their present position for less than five years. This figure reflects the "newness" of such roles in postsecondary educational institutions and the extent to which persons move from position to position.

**Percentages in the Percent column are computed based on all 650 respondents including missing records.*

***Percentages in the Valid Percent column are based on only valid data, not including missing data.*

**Percentages in the Percent column are computed based on all 650 respondents including missing records.*

***Percentages in the Valid Percent column are based on only valid data, not including missing data.*

TABLE 6. Number of Years DSCs Worked in Area of Student Services in Postsecondary Education

		Frequency	*Percent	**Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Less Than 5 years	155	23.8	24.9	24.9
	Five to Ten years	202	31.1	32.5	57.4
	More Than Ten years	265	40.8	42.6	100.0
	Total	622	95.7	100.0	
Missing	.00	28	4.3		
Total		650	100.0		

Discussion: 57% of the DSC personnel responding to the survey indicated they had worked in the field less than ten years, supporting the perception of "newness" in this profession.

TABLE 7. Range of Disciplines or Fields in Which DSCs Received Training and Degree

		Frequency	*Percent	**Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Education	165	25.4	28.9	28.9
	Arts and Sciences	81	12.5	14.2	43.1
	Counseling/Psychology	204	31.4	35.7	78.8
	Vocational/Adult	31	4.8	5.4	84.2
	Related Disability Services	90	13.8	15.8	100.0
	Total	571	87.8	100.0	
Missing	.00	79	12.2		
Total		650	100.0		

Discussion: The largest portion of DSCs came from the fields of counseling psychology (35.7%), with education being the second field of choice at 28.9%. Given that postsecondary disability support services is not a degreed field of training, personnel appear to have training in closely related fields.

**Percentages in the Percent column are computed based on all 650 respondents including missing records.*

***Percentages in the Valid Percent column are based on only valid data, not including missing data.*

TABLE 8. Highest Degree of Training Earned by DSCs

		Frequency	*Percent	**Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Less Than a Baccalaureate	11	1.7	1.8	1.8
	Baccalaureate	52	8.0	8.6	10.4
	Master's	442	68.0	72.9	83.3
	Doctoral	101	15.5	16.7	100.0
	Total	606	93.2	100.0	
Missing	.00	44	6.8		
Total		650	100.0		

Discussion: 73% of the DSC personnel responding to the survey indicated they possessed up to a master's degree; only 16.7% held doctoral degrees, and 8.6% possessed bachelor degrees.

**Percentages in the Percent column are computed based on all 650 respondents including missing records.*

***Percentages in the Valid Percent column are based on only valid data, not including missing data.*

2. **Other Questions of Disability Support Coordinator Sample:** Another question asked of respondents was: *Prior to your current position, did you have experience as an:*

   - Instructional faculty member
   - Equal opportunity/ADA compliance officer

   Of the 650 respondents 41% reportedly had instructional or faculty teaching experience before becoming a DSC. 10% reported prior experience as an equal opportunity/ADA compliance officer before becoming a DSC.

3. **Summary:** The majority of DSCs possesses a master's degree, and has worked in the area of Student Services in a postsecondary program for less than 10 years. Only 15.8% possessed training in related disability services. Examination of the range of disciplines in which DSC personnel have training implies the field is not only new, but lacking of its own discipline.

SECTION II

FREQUENCY AND TYPES OF EDUCATIONAL SUPPORTS IN POSTSECONDARY PROGRAMS (Question #1)

Section II of this report is devoted entirely to Question #1 of the national survey. Question #1 is comprised of 34 sub-items (specific supports) addressing the types and range of supports and accommodations offered to students with disabilities (SWDs) in postsecondary education settings. Table 9 provides an overview of the frequency and type of supports offered within surveyed institutions. A brief discussion of the overall findings follows Table I. A more detailed set of tables and discussion is provided for each sub-question or specific area of support is provided in Appendix A. The tables in Appendix A illustrate the distribution of responses for each of the 34 sub-items across public/private, two-year/four-year, student enrollment, locale, and competitiveness of admission.

A. Overall Picture of Frequency and Type of Educational Supports Offered

Because very little has been known about the current practice of offering educational supports/services to SWDs at the postsecondary level, Question #1 of the survey was prepared. Thirty-four sub-items were generated for Question #1 with each sub-item referencing a specific type of support. This detailed information was to assist the research team in establishing a national baseline of the frequency and types of educational supports offered to SWDs in postsecondary programs.

Question #1

What is the capacity of your institution to offer the following supports or accommodations as needed by students with disabilities?

Question #1 was structured as an ordinal-scale type question, where respondents were to indicate how often their institution offered each of 34 different supports or accommodations. The response options were as follows (See Appendix B for the actual survey text):

Frequency of Supports Offering
0 = not offered
1 = offered less than 25% of time
2 = offered 25-50% of time
3 = offered 51-75% of time
4 = offered more than 75% of time

Table 9 provides the percentages for responses to the 34 sub-items delineated within Question 1.

TABLE 9. Frequency of Provision of Specific Types of Educational Supports (Percentages: Based on 650 Respondents)

	Not Offered	Offered Less Than 25% of the Time	Offered 25% to 50% of the Time	Offered 51% to 75% of the Time	Offered More Than 75% of the Time
Summer Orientation Programs for SWDs	57.4%	9.2%	2.9%	3.8%	26.6%
Priority Registration/Course Scheduling	23.5%	11.7%	5.1%	5.7%	54.0%
Class Relocation	16.0%	14.8%	5.7%	11.1%	52.5%
Testing Accommodations	4.3%	3.4%	1.8%	6.2%	84.3%
Disability-Specific Scholarships	59.2%	20.8%	6.6%	3.7%	9.7%
Disability-Specific Assessment/Evaluation	53.7%	11.5%	6.5%	6.8%	21.5%
Advocacy	9.2%	6.2%	5.4%	10.9%	68.3%
Supports for Study Abroad	63.1%	14.8%	4.2%	4.3%	13.7%
Learning Center Laboratory	26.6%	5.1%	7.8%	9.7%	50.8%
Special Learning Strategies	12.8%	10.8%	15.2%	15.5%	45.7%
Developmental/Remedial Instruction	27.7%	9.7%	7.7%	8.5%	46.5%
Personal Counseling	7.1%	5.1%	8.5%	10.9%	68.5%
Accessible Transport on Campus	57.4%	6.2%	4.5%	5.1%	26.9%
Interpreter/Transliterator	19.5%	11.4%	5.5%	6.5%	57.1%
Note Takers/Scribes/Readers	9.8%	6.2%	6.6%	10.0%	67.4%
Tutors	13.7%	4.9%	10.9%	14.5%	56.0%
Real-Time Captioning	70.6%	8.2%	3.4%	3.1%	14.8%

TABLE 9. (continued)

AT Evaluations for Students	58.5%	13.8%	6.6%	4.8%	16.3%
Skills Training on Equipment/Software	28.5%	16.2%	14.6%	10.5%	30.3%
Equipment or Software Provision (Loan/Lease/Purchase)	34.6%	15.5%	11.5%	12.3%	26.0%
AT Supports Across Campus	24.5%	12.2%	14.0%	14.8%	34.6%
Adaptive Furniture	22.9%	14.9%	10.9%	15.7%	35.5%
Document Conversion	34.3%	13.8%	10.9%	9.7%	31.2%
Communication Skills	25.8%	15.5%	13.1%	11.1%	34.5%
Study Skills	9.2%	8.9%	9.7%	13.2%	58.9%
Memory Skills	21.5%	15.8%	13.7%	11.4%	37.5%
Meta-Cognitive Strategies	26.6%	15.5%	16.3%	10.2%	31.4%
Organizational and Time Management Skills	10.8%	9.8%	10.9%	15.8%	52.6%
Self-Advocacy Skills	15.4%	7.5%	12.8%	16.3%	48.0%
Career/Vocational Assessment and Counseling	10.5%	5.7%	9.8%	13.1%	60.9%
Work Experience or Work-Study Opportunities	14.9%	12.9%	13.1%	14.9%	44.2%
Internships/Externships	22.6%	13.5%	12.9%	12.0%	38.9%
Job Placement Services	21.1%	10.2%	10.2%	12.6%	46.0%
Facilitate Transfer of Supports to the Work Setting	54.3%	18.0%	9.4%	5.2%	13.1%
Average Sum of Percentage	**28.46%**	**11.17%**	**9.08%**	**10.00%**	**41.30%**

Discussion: The average sum of percentage reflects the mean for each column. On average, supports and accommodations were offered regularly (more than 75% of the time) to SWDs across the sample 41.30% of the time, and not offered at all, 28.46% of the time. The following overview of findings discusses the data provided in Table 9.

B. Overview of Findings

- The supports offered to SWDs most often in postsecondary education settings were testing accommodation (84% responded that they offered that service more than 75% of the time).

- The more commonly offered educational supports are: (1) note takers (67% indicated that note taking was a support offered more than 75% of the time); (2) personal counseling (69% indicated that counseling was offered more than 75% of the time); (3) advocacy assistance (69% indicated that advocacy assistance was offered more than 75% of the time). By contrast, SWDs indicated through a national focus group project that the type and timing of advocacy assistance was problematic— students requested more focus on the development of self-advocacy skills rather than focusing upon others providing advocacy and information.

- Offering of related supports was fairly common across all types of postsecondary institutions: (1) organization skill assistance (61% indicated that organizational skill development activities were offered more than 75% of the time); (2) study skills (59% indicated that study skill assistance or training was offered more than 75% of the time). SWDs through national focus groups indicated organization and time management or coordination of supports within and across their personal, educational, and social life was a major concern not often addressed by related agencies or postsecondary institutions. This is often cited as a reason for dropping out of postsecondary education or for not progressing at a consistent pace with their non-disabled students.

- Offering of career related supports was fairly common (although it was not determined whether such supports are part of the generic student services or provided by disability support staff): 61% offered career assessment services more than 75% of the time); 46% offered job placement services more than 75% of the time).

- Of concern to SWDs was the extent to which supports provided during their educational years would transfer to subsequent work or employment settings (NCSPES, 2000[a]). Very few disability support personnel indicated that their institution offered such assistance: 54% indicated that they offered such support less than 25% of the time, while 13% indicated they offered this support more than 75% of the time.

- Disability specific scholarships and study abroad opportunities were rarely offered to SWDs in postsecondary programs.

- Less than 50% of the responding institutions offered disability specific assessments or evaluations.

- Real-time captioning was rarely offered in postsecondary educational programs; 71% indicated that they offered real-time captioning less than 25% of the time.

- Assistive technology evaluations for SWDs were rarely offered in postsecondary programs; close to 60% reported that they offered such a service less than 25% of the time.

C. Breakdown by Institutional Type

To learn more about the frequency and type of educational supports or accommodations offered in postsecondary institutions, researchers conducted an analysis of data across the 34 items (specific areas of supports) for Question #1 by types of institutional characteristics. The four different analysis were conducted across the 34 items, providing a comparison across (1) public and private institutions, (2) large, medium, and small institutions based on overall student enrollment, (3) two-year and four-year institutions, (4) type of locale based upon urban, suburban, and rural status, and (5) the extent of admission competitiveness for the institutions.

Table 10 provides the mean percentages across all 34 support areas surveyed, with a breakout for the five institutional variables described above. This analysis yielded the following findings:

- Public postsecondary institutions more frequently offer educational supports and accommodations than private schools (32% of public schools vs. 23% of private schools offered overall supports more than 75% of the time).

- Two-year and four-year postsecondary institutions appear to offer educational supports and accommodations at about the same frequency (42% of both types of institutions offer supports 75% of the time). More detailed analysis of each support area (Appendix A) indicated that some areas of support were provided with much higher frequency in two-year institutions (see discussion below).

- Larger institutions (based on overall student enrollment) offered educational supports at a much higher frequency than small institutions when looking across all types of supports offered (36% of small institutions vs. 50% of large institutions offered supports more than 75% of the time).

- When looking at type of locale of the postsecondary institutions, there was little difference in the frequency of overall support provisions.

- The competitiveness of admission standards for postsecondary institutions does not seem to affect the frequency of overall support provision to SWDs. The overall differences between those institutions with few admission restrictions and those who were very demanding, was only a couple of percentage points.

Individual item (specific area of support) analysis for the above institutional characteristic breakouts was also conducted and tables were developed for specific areas

of significant difference. Given the large number of tables yielded from this analysis, they have been placed in Appendix A for the interested reader. A brief discussion of each of the areas of support is provided with specific tables.

TABLE 10. Overall Frequency of Provision of Types of Educational Supports or Accommodations by Breakout of Institutional Type: (Public vs. Private, Two-Year vs. Four-Year, Overall Student Enrollment, Type of Locale, and Competitiveness)

Institutional Characteristic		Not Offered	Offered Less Than 25% of the Time	Offered 25% to 50% of the Time	Offered 51% to 75% of the Time	Offered More Than 75% of the Time
Public vs. Private	Public	23%	12%	15%	10%	32%
	Private	36%	10%	16%	12%	23%
Two-year vs. Four-year	Two-year	26%	11%	10%	11%	42%
	Four-year	28%	11%	9%	10%	42%
Student Enrollment for 1998-1999	Small	34%	11%	9%	10%	36%
	Medium	24%	11%	9%	10%	44%
	Large	17%	12%	10%	11%	50%
Type of Locale	Urban	26%	11%	9%	11%	44%
	Suburban	28%	11%	9%	10%	41%
	Rural or Small Town	27%	12%	9%	10%	42%
Competitiveness	Few Admission Restrictions	26%	12%	10%	11%	42%
	Moderately Demanding	28%	11%	9%	9%	42%
	Among the More Demanding	27%	11%	9%	11%	43%
	Very Demanding	31%	11%	8%	10%	41%

D. Public Versus Private Institutions: Breakout for Specific Items or Types of Supports

Overall, public institutions were more likely than private institutions to offer with greater frequency, a specific service or accommodation to SWDs. In the area of assistive technology, institutions, especially in the private sector, are less likely to offer distance-learning opportunities for students who are deaf and blind through such services as accessible on-line student services, TV courses, and Web-based courseware. Assistive technology supports were offered at different levels of frequency when comparing public versus the private sector. For example, 87% of public institutions vs. 55% of private institutions offered assistive technology supports across campus programs (e.g. library, computer lab) (see Tables in Appendix A). Overall, about half of the surveyed public institutions failed to offer assistive technology evaluations for students, and this figure rises to 76% in the private sector. The one area in which private institutions excelled in the frequency of support offerings was supports for study abroad.

E. Two-Year Versus Four-Year Institutions

Two-year institutions were more likely than four-year institutions to more frequently offer a service or accommodation to SWDs in several specific support areas. When comparing supports within two-year and four-year institutions, two-year institutions offer supports with a greater frequency in many areas surveyed. Learning center laboratory activities, developmental/remedial instruction, assistive technology and software provision, skills training on equipment/software, and assistive technology supports in programs across campus are more often provided at two-year institutions.

F. Student Enrollment

Analysis of data around institutional size (based upon overall student enrollment) indicated that smaller institutions less frequently offered supports to SWDs. Overall student enrollment was defined as follows: small: less than 3,000; medium: 3, 000-9,999; large: 10,000 or more. Small institutions did offer the more common supports such as testing accommodations, developmental/remedial instruction, personal counseling, tutors, and communication skills about as often as medium and large institutions (see Tables in Appendix A). Other than the areas of support mentioned above, there exists a distinct relationship between size of student enrollment and the institution's capacity to offer supports for SWDs: the larger the institution, the more frequently supports were offered.

G. Locale of Institution

For the most part, locale of an institution (urban, suburban, or rural/small town) did not have much of an influence on the institution's frequency of offering supports or accommodations to SWDs. There was, as always, variation among the groups. Exceptions to the previous statement are as follows: urban institutions did a little better in offering disability-specific assessment/evaluation, interpreters, assistive technology evaluations for students, and provision of equipment or software. Rural or small town institutions did somewhat better at offering services, such as learning center laboratories, developmental/remedial instruction, tutors, and communications skill programs.

H. Competitiveness of Institution

Across the range of supports and accommodations in the survey, institutions with few admission restrictions tended to offer more supports and accommodations to SWDs. Institutions with very demanding requirements tended to less frequently, offer supports to SWDs. Exceptions to the rule are as follows: very demanding institutions offer slightly better support in the areas of accessible transport on campus, note takers/scribers, and real-time captioning.

SECTION III

STUDENT AND SUPPORT PROGRAM CHARACTERISTICS

INTRODUCTION

Section III addresses the remaining portion of the survey, minus the demographics data covered in Section I. Because Section III covers the bulk of the survey, the reader may again find it helpful to refer to Appendix B, which contains the actual survey instrument. Familiarizing oneself with the actual survey questions, and the format in which they were asked, may make it easier to comprehend the range and amount of data covered in this section.

Important areas of study such as the transfer of supports to postsecondary employment settings and to the extent of which institutions conduct community outreach programs are included in this section. Moreover, the areas of monitoring and evaluating quality and effectiveness of supports for SWDs, written policy, funding issues that may impact an institution's ability to serve SWDs, and the major concerns for disability support coordinators are also topics covered in this section.

A. Number of Students Requesting Supports/Services

As a part of establishing a baseline of supports requested by, and offered to, SWDs in postsecondary institutions, the research team wanted to know how many SWDs requested, and were deemed qualified to receive, supports and services, and the percentage of those students who actually received such support. Two questions were used to establish this baseline. The first question asked for the number of SWDs within the institution who requested and were deemed qualified for supports and services and other reasonable accommodations under the Americans with Disabilities Act (including students with 504 plans). The following table displays the average number of SWDs who requested and qualified for educational supports and services by different types of postsecondary institution.

TABLE 11. Number of SWDs Who Requested and Qualified To Receive Support Services

Institutional Characteristic		Mean
All Institutions		231.05
Public vs. Private	Public	307.31
	Private	73.80
Two-year vs. Four-year	Two-year	261.31
	Four-year	217.19
Student Enrollment for 1998-1999	Small	68.52
	Medium	207.81
	Large	575.64
Locale	Urban	299.24
	Suburban	260.07
	Rural or Small Town	167.50
Competitiveness	Few Admission Restrictions	249.32
	Moderately Demanding	224.19
	Among the More Demanding	253.46
	Very Demanding	171.22

Discussion: The average number of SWDs who requested and qualified to receive educational supports and services across all types of postsecondary education institutions was 231. Public postsecondary institutions enrolled and interacted with significantly more SWDs than private institutions. Overall, two-year institutions, of comparable size, served more SWDs than four-year institutions. The larger the institution, typically, the greater number of SWDs who requested and qualified to receive educational supports and services.

B. Average Percents of SWDs Receiving Supports and Services

A second question asked of respondents is as follows: "Approximately what *percent* of eligible SWDs were offered and received educational supports and services during the past academic year?" The following table shows the *average percents* of SWDs who were offered and received supports and services at a given type of postsecondary institution:

TABLE 12. Average Percentage of SWDs (As compared with all SWDs Known to the Disability Support Office) Offered and Received Supports/Services During the Past Academic Year by Institutional Type

Institutional Characteristic		Mean
All Institutions		66.99
Public vs. Private	Public	69.56
	Private	67.23
Two-year vs. Four-year	Two-year	66.85
	Four-year	70.14
Student Enrollment for 1998-1999	Small	65.64
	Medium	70.03
	Large	73.17
Locale	Urban	68.22
	Suburban	68.37
	Rural or Small Town	69.53
Competitiveness	Few Admission Restrictions	67.50
	Moderately Demanding	69.93
	Among the More Demanding	69.38
	Very Demanding	71.35

Discussion: The percentage of SWDs in postsecondary institutions that *qualified for and received* supports and services across all types of institutions is approximately 67%, or about two-thirds of the population of SWDs known to the institutions' disability support offices. Looking at the table above, that number is fairly consistent across all institutional types, with four-year and large-size institutions having a slightly higher average.

C. Percentage of Students Served by Disability Type

In an effort to learn more about the characteristics (types of disabilities served) of SWDs receiving services and supports in postsecondary institutions, respondents were asked to identify the percentages of students served by disability type. For example, the types of questions asked in this area, included: what is the general distribution of types of disabilities in the population of SWDs in your institution? Is one type of disability more prevalent than others? Does any particular type of disability align more with a certain type of institution? Respondents were asked to estimate the percentage of services/supports provided within a given disability category. The following table displays the percentage of disability categories receiving supports, with breakouts by institutional characteristics.

TABLE 13. Percentage of SWDs Receiving Support by Disability Type

Institutional Characteristic		Multiple Disabilities	Blind or Visual Impairment	Deaf or Hearing Impairment	Health Impairment	Learning Disability and/or Attention Deficit/ADHD	Mental Health / Emotional / Psychological Disability
All Institutions		**14.37**	**3.99**	**4.34**	**7.67**	**43.38**	**7.91**
Public vs. Private	Public	15.87	4.31	4.91	8.31	42.27	8.80
	Private	12.11	3.73	3.58	7.05	50.38	6.78
Two-year vs. Four-year	Two-year	15.88	4.12	5.30	7.48	38.57	9.02
	Four-year	13.90	4.13	3.95	8.21	48.97	7.60
Student Enrollment for 1998-1999	Small	11.88	4.19	4.05	7.00	43.58	7.40
	Medium	16.61	3.99	4.54	8.03	46.40	8.75
	Large	17.01	4.30	4.94	9.51	46.32	9.05
Locale	Urban	17.03	4.62	4.70	8.35	40.48	9.16
	Suburban	14.36	3.19	3.87	7.89	48.04	8.06
	Rural or Small Town	13.19	4.38	4.73	7.55	46.37	7.50
Competitiveness	Few Admission Restrictions	16.36	4.15	4.85	7.75	43.19	8.90
	Moderately Demanding	13.34	4.61	4.52	7.70	46.41	7.41
	Among the More Demanding	15.31	3.41	3.62	8.46	46.05	8.25
	Very Demanding	9.30	3.48	3.76	8.24	46.89	6.43

35

36

TABLE 13. Percentage of SWDs Receiving Support by Disability Type *(continued)*

Institutional Characteristic		Mobility Impairment	Orthopedic Disability without Mobility Impairment	Speech or Language Impairment	Cognitive Disability (Including Mental Retardation)	Acquired Head Injury / Traumatic Brain Injury
All Institutions		**6.95**	**2.45**	**1.23**	**2.10**	**2.31**
Public vs. Private	Public	8.23	2.94	1.11	2.69	2.64
	Private	4.94	1.61	1.24	.91	1.66
Two-year vs. Four-year	Two-year	8.35	3.34	1.19	3.28	2.29
	Four-year	6.43	1.98	1.12	1.36	2.37
Student Enrollment for 1998-1999	Small	5.71	1.62	.98	1.27	1.77
	Medium	8.02	3.23	1.41	3.22	2.61
	Large	9.11	3.32	1.24	2.25	3.12
Locale	Urban	7.74	3.47	1.30	1.90	2.12
	Suburban	7.70	2.39	1.24	2.61	2.84
	Rural or Small Town	6.46	1.84	1.00	1.96	2.17
Competitiveness	Few Admission Restrictions	8.40	3.03	1.07	3.27	2.60
	Moderately Demanding	6.43	2.09	1.42	1.18	2.16
	Among the More Demanding	5.68	2.29	1.20	1.41	2.24
	Very Demanding	6.41	1.28	.59	.26	1.57

38

37

Discussion: The most frequently reported student by disability type, across all institutions was learning disability and/or attention deficit/ADHD (average of 43% for all institutions), with private and large-size institutions reporting slightly higher averages for this category. Four-year institutions had significantly higher percentages of SWDs with a learning disability and/or attention deficit disorder than two-year institutions. The category of multiple disabilities came in a distant second with an average of 14% across all institutions, with large and urban institutions having slightly more than the average for this category. Public and two-year institutions had significantly more students with a cognitive disability than private and four-year institutions. Public institutions reported significantly more students with a cognitive disability and orthopedic disability without mobility impairment than private institutions. The more competitive (based on admission requirements) institutions had a lower than average percentage of SWDs receiving supports, with the exception of students in the categories of learning disabilities and health impairment disabilities. It is interesting to note that students with hidden disabilities, including learning disabilities, and health impairments were approximately 50% of SWDs served in postsecondary programs.

It should be mentioned that the reported information about SWDs represents only those students who receive support and who have identified themselves to their institution as having a disability, as they are the only students whom the institutions had data to report. A category of "Other" was included in the questionnaire, with little or no response.

D. Institutional Organization of Support Services

Researchers wanted to know how institutions approached and organized the provision of supports and accommodations for SWDs within their campus. Respondents chose from one of the five categories provided in the table below to indicate the organizational structure and approach used to deliver disability supports and services. Table 13 displays the percentage for different responses for the survey sample (650 respondents).

TABLE 14. How is Your Institution Organized to Provide Reasonable Accommodations and Support on Services for SWDs?

Separate, Centralized Unit Serving SWDs Only	Separate, Centralized Unit Serving all Persons with Disabilities on Campus (Faculty, Staff, and Students)	Decentralized Services within Academic Departments / Units	SWDs Receive Services From the Same Units as all Other Students	Other
45.4%	16.6%	9.4%	37.8%	14.9%

Discussion: The most common method of organization for disability support provision was a separate, centralized unit serving only SWDs (45.4%). The next most common means of providing services was through a similar unit that provided services to all other students (i.e., office of general student services) (37.8%). The "other" category was made up of responses that were a combination of two or more of the categories offered (e.g. separate, decentralized units serving SWDs only).

E. Screening Services

Do postsecondary institutions offer any kind of screening services for students with learning disabilities? Respondents were asked whether or not their institution offered screening services or assistance to students to determine if they had specific learning disabilities (previously undiagnosed). The following table shows the average percentage of "yes" responses by institution type.

TABLE 15. Are Screening Services Offered by Institution Type?

Institutional Characteristic		Screen Services Offered to Determine a Specific Learning Disability
All Institutions		37.3%
Public vs. Private	Public	43.4%
	Private	28.0%
Two-year vs. Four-year	Two-year	35.8%
	Four-year	40.4%
Student Enrollment for 1998-1999	Small	27.4%
	Medium	38.3%
	Large	59.5%
Locale	Urban	46.7%
	Suburban	39.2%
	Rural or Small Town	31.5%
Competitiveness	Few Admission Restrictions	34.5%
	Moderately Demanding	39.1%
	Among the More Demanding	50.5%
	Very Demanding	37.0%

Discussion: Approximately 1/3 of the responding institutions indicated they offered a screening service for students (37%). Public institutions (43%) offer a screening service significantly more often than private institutions (28%). The larger the institution the more likely it would offer a screening service. Urban and the more demanding postsecondary institutions were more likely to offer screening services than their counterparts.

F. Distance Learning Access for Students Who are Deaf or Blind

The research team wanted to determine if the population of SWDs who are deaf or blind had access to current technological advances and benefits within their postsecondary institution. The question asked was: "Does your institution offer access to distance learning opportunities for the deaf and blind population?" The following table shows the average percentage of "Yes" responses for different institutional type for each type of service:

TABLE 16. Distance Learning Access by Institution Type for Deaf or Blind Students

Institutional Characteristic		On-line Library Services	On-line Student Services (e.g., Registration)	Accessible TV Courses (e.g., Captioning, Descriptive Narration)	Accessible Web-based Courseware
All Institutions		47.8%	33.5%	20.3%	34.2%
Public vs. private	Public	56.2%	40.8%	26.3%	41.5%
	Private	34.2%	21.8%	9.8%	21.8%
Two-year vs. Four-year	Two-year	48.0%	29.7%	26.4%	41.5%
	Four-year	50.1%	38.2%	17.6%	31.2%
Student Enrollment for 1998-1999	Small	34.7%	21.3%	12.3%	28.2%
	Medium	51.9%	36.1%	21.3%	39.3%
	Large	74.3%	60.1%	36.5%	45.9%
Locale	Urban	55.3%	41.6%	22.3%	34.5%
	Suburban	43.9%	31.0%	21.6%	33.3%
	Rural or Small Town	49.0%	31.5%	19.5%	37.5%
Competitive-ness	Few Admission Restrictions	50.5%	29.2%	25.0%	39.9%
	Moderately Demanding	49.5%	39.6%	16.7%	30.7%
	Among the More Demanding	44.2%	41.1%	18.9%	30.5%
	Very Demanding	54.3%	37.0%	17.4%	37.0%

Discussion: The responding institutions offered on-line library services less than half the time (47.8%) for students with deafness or blindness. On-line student services (e.g. registration) were offered at one-third of the institutions (33.5%). Accessible TV courses were offered at 20% of the institutions, and accessible web-based courseware was offered at 34% of the institutions.

More public institutions offered slightly more such services in every category when compared with private institutions. Four-year institutions offered on-line library and student services when compared with two-year institutions, and more two-year institutions offered accessible TV courses and web-based courseware when compared with four-year institutions. More larger institutions offered more distance learning services. No trend was detected when comparing locale or competitiveness of institution.

G. Facilitation of Student Linkages with Other Community Resources

Beyond providing supports and services to address the educational needs of SWDs on campus, postsecondary institutions are expected to assist in connecting students with other community resources. One of the key study questions of the survey focused on whether postsecondary institutions had reached out to other community resources that provide supports to people with disabilities. If they had provided outreach services, each respondent was asked to indicate the types of resources or agencies. The following table provides the average percentage, by institutional type, for those respondents who answered, "Yes" to the following question: Does your institution facilitate, as needed, a student's linkages with other community resources (such as vocational rehabilitation, transportation to/from campus)? (See Appendix B for further description of this question.)

TABLE 17. Facilitation of Students' Linkages with Other Community Resources

Institutional Characteristic		Facilitate Student's Linkages with Other Community Resources
All Institutions		74.9%
Public vs. Private	Public	84.4%
	Private	62.7%
Two-year vs. Four-year	Two-year	88.2%
	Four-year	70.5%
Student Enrollment for 1998-1999	Small	71.1%
	Medium	79.8%
	Large	87.2%
Locale	Urban	75.1%
	Suburban	72.5%
	Rural or Small Town	82.9%
Competitiveness	Few Admission Restrictions	84.7%
	Moderately Demanding	74.5%
	Among the More Demanding	68.4%
	Very Demanding	65.2%

Discussion: Nearly 75% of the surveyed postsecondary institutions provided services and facilitating linkages with other community resources. Public institutions offered significantly more support in this area than private institutions. Two-year institutions facilitated these relationships more often than four-year institutions. The larger the institution the more often this type of support was offered. Rural or small-town institutions and those institutions with few admissions restrictions facilitated connections to community resources more often than other types of postsecondary institutions.

The following table addresses the type and frequency of outreach programs offered to SWDs. The table shows the average percentage— by institutional program type— that responded "Yes" to the following question: Has your program conducted outreach, with activities and/or materials, to any of the following:

TABLE 18. Percentage of Outreach Services Offered by Institutional Type

Institutional Characteristic		High School Counselors or Transition Coordinator	Special Education Teachers	State Vocational Rehabilitation Personnel	Other Rehabilitation Professionals	Federal Programs	Businesses/ Employers	Parent / Family Organizations	Consumer /Advocacy Groups	Other
All Institutions		70.3%	58.2%	72.3%	59.1%	36.6%	32.5%	45.5%	40.2%	6.2%
Public vs. Private	Public	86.3%	72.7%	87.9%	73.0%	48.8%	40.8%	52.1%	49.5%	7.3%
	Private	43.5%	33.2%	46.1%	34.2%	14.5%	18.1%	34.7%	23.8%	3.6%
Two-year vs. Four-year	Two-year	87.4%	76.8%	87.4%	76.0%	50.0%	45.1%	51.2%	45.9%	6.9%
	Four-year	63.1%	49.3%	66.4%	50.7%	30.1%	26.0%	43.6%	38.5%	5.7%
Student Enrollment for 1998-1999	Small	54.5%	45.1%	59.2%	48.4%	24.5%	25.6%	36.5%	26.0%	5.4%
	Medium	84.2%	69.4%	83.6%	66.7%	44.3%	35.5%	52.5%	51.9%	4.4%
	Large	93.9%	77.0%	93.9%	79.1%	56.1%	44.6%	60.8%	59.5%	10.1%
Locale	Urban	69.0%	57.9%	75.1%	65.5%	41.1%	39.6%	48.7%	47.2%	8.6%
	Suburban	72.5%	55.0%	70.2%	55.0%	33.3%	30.4%	46.8%	43.9%	3.5%
	Rural or Small Town	76.5%	65.3%	78.1%	61.8%	39.0%	31.5%	45.8%	35.9%	6.0%
Competitive-ness	Few Admission Restrictions	83.7%	72.6%	86.8%	71.9%	44.8%	36.5%	47.2%	43.1%	7.3%
	Moderately Demanding	67.7%	56.8%	70.3%	54.7%	34.4%	33.9%	50.5%	43.8%	5.7%
	Among the More Demanding	64.2%	47.4%	62.1%	52.6%	31.6%	30.5%	45.3%	38.9%	5.3%
	Very Demanding	43.5%	23.9%	45.7%	37.0%	26.1%	23.9%	32.6%	30.4%	4.3%

Discussion: Two-thirds of the sampled institutions indicated that they reached out to people and programs such as high school counselors, special education teachers, and state vocational and other rehabilitation professionals. Only one-third of the respondents indicated they had interacted with federal programs, and business/employers. Less than one-half indicated outreach to parent/family organizations and consumer/advocacy groups. When comparing different types of institutions:

- Public institutions and two-year institutions offered more outreach programs to every type of community resource surveyed than their counterparts (private institutions and four-year institutions).
- The larger the school, the more outreach linkage was offered to SWDs.
- The lesser the competitiveness of the school, the more outreach linkage was offered to SWDs.
- An implication for SWDs is that they will receive more outreach support in a large public two-year institution that is not competitive. These same qualifiers could also apply to negotiated agreement in admission practice.

H. Negotiated Agreements and/or Interagency Agreements with Vocational Rehabilitation

Further investigation of program outreach was conducted by asking respondents if they had obtained negotiated interagency agreements with vocational rehabilitation or other agencies in support of SWDs. The following table shows, by institutional type, the average percentage of "Yes" responses to the above question:

TABLE 19. Negotiated Agreements by Institutional Type

Institutional Characteristic		Negotiated Agreements for Serving SWDs
All Institutions		**48.8%**
Public vs. Private	Public	55.9%
	Private	38.3%
Two-year vs. Four-year	Two-year	59.3%
	Four-year	44.4%
Student enrollment for 1998-1999	Small	48.4%
	Medium	47.5%
	Large	57.4%
Locale	Urban	52.8%
	Suburban	43.3%
	Rural or small town	53.0%
Competitiveness	Few admission restrictions	55.9%
	Moderately demanding	48.4%
	Among the more demanding	36.8%
	Very demanding	50.0%

Discussion: Across the sample, less than half the institutions established and maintained negotiated interagency agreements with vocational rehabilitation and/or other agencies to serve SWDs. Public and two-year institutions facilitated significantly more agreements than their counterparts. Also, institutions with few admission restrictions were more likely to have negotiated agreements in place than other institutions.

I. Faculty/Staff Aid in Working with SWDs

Researchers wanted to determine the types, and extent, of support offered to faculty and staff teaching SWDs at their institutions. Respondents were asked, "Which of the following types of material or activity, if any, are offered for faculty/staff when working with SWDs?" The following table shows the average percentage of "Yes" responses by institutional type:

TABLE 20. Faculty/Staff Aid in Working with SWDs

Institutional characteristic		Faculty/staff handbook	Annual mailings to faculty/staff	Frequent workshops &/or presentations	Consultations with faculty	Information products
All schools		59.7%	50.3%	51.7%	89.7%	64.9%
Public vs. private	Public	67.5%	53.8%	60.4%	96.0%	71.6%
	Private	49.2%	48.2%	38.3%	86.5%	57.5%
Two-year vs. Four-year	Two-year	63.8%	49.2%	61.0%	92.3%	73.2%
	Four-year	60.4%	53.9%	48.5%	93.5%	63.1%
Student enrollment for 1998-1999	Small	50.9%	42.2%	38.3%	87.4%	58.5%
	Medium	67.8%	56.3%	63.9%	97.8%	75.4%
	Large	76.4%	66.2%	70.3%	98.6%	74.3%
Locale	Urban	60.9%	49.7%	61.9%	90.4%	67.5%
	Suburban	67.3%	59.1%	50.3%	94.7%	66.7%
	Rural or small town	59.0%	49.4%	49.8%	94.0%	67.7%
Competitiveness	Few admissions restrictions	61.5%	50.3%	60.1%	93.8%	71.5%
	Moderately demanding	64.6%	56.8%	51.6%	93.2%	64.1%
	Among the more demanding	57.9%	50.5%	45.3%	92.6%	64.2%
	Very demanding	60.9%	47.8%	39.1%	89.1%	60.9%

Discussion: More than half of the responding institutions offered supports and materials for faculty/staff working with SWDs across the five types of aids surveyed in all areas surveyed. Public institutions offered significantly more aid and support to faculty than private institutions in all areas. Two-year and four-year institutions are about equal in all areas, except for frequent workshops and/or presentations, where two-year institutions offer significantly more assistance. In general, the larger the school, the more aid offered to faculty/staff. The consultation model is far above the most frequently provided support with faculty at 89.7%.

J. Monitoring and Evaluating Quality and Effectiveness of Services for SWDs

46

Researchers wanted to know if postsecondary institutions monitor the quality and effectiveness of supports and services offered for SWDs, and if they do, how that monitoring is completed. Respondents were provided a number of methods to choose from and asked to respond regarding the specific method. The following table shows the average percentage of "Yes" responses for a given institutional type by category of monitoring method.

47

TABLE 21. Monitoring and Evaluation of Quality and Effectiveness of Services for SWDs

Institutional Characteristic		Counts of Services Provided	Student Satisfaction Survey	Student Retention Rate	Student Graduation Rate	Faculty Satisfaction Survey	Faculty Evaluation of Workshops	Job Placement Rate	Alumni Follow-up Surveys
All Institutions		71.8%	55.8%	58.0%	58.3%	21.8%	31.5%	18.2%	20.5%
Public vs. Private	Public	81.5%	65.4%	61.1%	61.4%	26.3%	38.2%	19.4%	21.8%
	Private	59.1%	43.5%	57.0%	58.0%	14.5%	21.2%	17.6%	19.7%
Two-year vs. Four-year	Two-year	75.2%	65.9%	65.0%	62.6%	26.8%	42.3%	28.0%	30.5%
	Four-year	74.0%	53.7%	56.4%	58.8%	19.8%	26.6%	12.7%	14.9%
Student Enrollment for 1998-1999	Small	63.5%	52.3%	62.8%	63.5%	18.1%	26.4%	24.9%	23.8%
	Medium	84.2%	56.8%	54.6%	54.6%	21.3%	34.4%	12.6%	16.9%
	Large	84.5%	70.9%	60.8%	61.5%	31.8%	43.2%	14.2%	21.6%
Locale	Urban	72.1%	64.0%	55.8%	57.9%	26.9%	34.5%	17.8%	21.8%
	Suburban	80.1%	52.6%	60.8%	56.7%	14.6%	31.0%	16.4%	17.5%
	Rural or Small Town	72.9%	57.8%	62.9%	65.3%	24.7%	33.5%	21.5%	23.9%
Competitiveness	Few Admission Restrictions	77.8%	59.7%	61.8%	60.1%	24.0%	37.2%	20.8%	23.6%
	Moderately Demanding	70.8%	61.5%	57.3%	57.3%	24.5%	30.7%	20.8%	22.4%
	Among the More Demanding	74.7%	55.8%	68.4%	69.5%	22.1%	31.6%	14.7%	18.9%
	Very Demanding	67.4%	41.3%	43.5%	58.7%	8.7%	19.6%	8.7%	8.7%

Discussion: Across all respondents, the method of counting services provided was the most popular form of documenting or monitoring supports and services provided to SWDs. Student satisfaction surveys, student retention rates, and student graduation rates were more popular as a means of documentation than faculty satisfaction surveys, faculty evaluation of workshops, job placement rates, and alumni follow-up surveys. Public and two-year institutions focused on documenting and monitoring their activities more often than counterparts across all areas surveyed.

K. Transfer of Supports to Postgraduate Employment Settings

A smoother transition from postsecondary institution to subsequent work settings could occur for SWDs if the transfer of educational supports to the work setting were a common practice in postsecondary education. According to SWDs participating in a series of national focus groups, such an effort "could well make the difference in deciding to attend postsecondary institution and obtaining 'successful' employment." A question within the survey asked if postsecondary programs coordinated or facilitated the transfer of educational supports for SWDs to their postgraduate employment settings. Respondents were asked, "Has your program attempted to coordinate the transfer of educational supports for students to their post-graduate employment setting?" The following table shows the percentage of "Yes" responses by institutional type:

TABLE 22. Transfer of Supports to Postgraduate Employment Settings

Institutional Characteristic		Coordinate the Transfer of Effective Supports for Students to Their Post-graduate Employment Setting
All Institutions		26.8%
Public vs. Private	Public	28.7%
	Private	23.8%
Two-year vs. Four-year	Two-year	28.0%
	Four-year	26.6%
Student Enrollment for 1998-1999	Small	22.7%
	Medium	30.6%
	Large	31.8%
Locale	Urban	35.5%
	Suburban	23.4%
	Rural or small town	23.5%
Competitiveness	Few admissions restrictions	25.3%
	Moderately demanding	26.0%
	Among the more demanding	36.8%
	Very demanding	26.1%

Discussion: Only about 1 in 4 institutions facilitated transfer of supports to subsequent work settings, with all institutional types reporting equally poor results for this item. Urban institutions and those with more demanding admission requirements offered more services concerning the transfer of supports than other institutional types. This low positive response indicates a need for increased efforts in this area.

L. Affect of Lack of Resources

The research team wanted to obtain the extent lack of resources affected an institution's ability to serve SWDs. The first question dealt with funding issues, and respondents were given four options from which to choose. The following table shows the average response percentage, by institutional type, to the following question: "To what extent does lack of funding affect your unit's ability to serve or support SWDs?"

TABLE 23. Lack of Funding

Institutional Characteristic		No Lack of Funding	Very Little Effect	A Moderate Extent	A Great Deal
All Institutions		9.7%	21.6%	38.3%	30.4%
Public vs. Private	Public	8.4%	22.8%	40.3%	28.5%
	Private	12.5%	18.8%	34.4%	34.4%
Two-year vs. Four-year	Two-year	9.1%	23.0%	37.4%	30.5%
	Four-year	10.1%	20.5%	39.1%	30.3%
Student Enrollment for 1998-1999	Small	10.2%	22.5%	32.0%	35.3%
	Medium	8.4%	21.2%	39.7%	30.7%
	Large	10.8%	21.6%	45.9%	21.6%
Locale	Urban	10.9%	19.7%	39.9%	29.5%
	Suburban	11.8%	22.9%	36.5%	28.8%
	Rural or Small Town	7.2%	22.5%	38.6%	31.7%
Competitiveness	Few Admission Restrictions	7.1%	20.1%	39.6%	33.2%
	Moderately Demanding	8.4%	22.6%	36.3%	32.6%
	Among the More Demanding	14.7%	20.0%	44.2%	21.1%
	Very Demanding	20.0%	31.1%	26.7%	22.2%

Discussion: About two-thirds, or 69%, of all institutions reported that lack of funding impacts moderately or a great deal, the supports and services provided by their unit. Public and private institutions reported lack of funding as having an affect on their units' activities about equally, even though public institutions offer more services and supports to SWDs.

A similar phenomenon occurs between two-year and four-year institutions. Although lack of funding is perceived to affect their delivery of supports and services about equally, two-year institutions tend to offer more supports and services to SWDs than four-year institutions. The more competitive institutions reported that a lack of funding had somewhat less of an impact on their ability to provide services and supports to SWDs.

The second question addressed staffing resources by asking the respondent, "To what extent does a lack of staff with specialized skills affect your unit?" The following table shows the average percentage, by institutional type, of responses for each category:

TABLE 24. Lack of Specialized Staff

Institutional Characteristic		No Lack of Specialized Staff	Very Little Effect	A Moderate Extent	A Great Deal
All Institutions		11.3%	26.3%	40.2%	22.1%
Public vs. Private	Public	13.2%	24.5%	41.5%	20.9%
	Private	6.3%	30.9%	37.7%	25.1%
Two-year vs. Four-year	Two-year	9.9%	27.2%	41.2%	21.8%
	Four-year	11.8%	26.0%	39.7%	22.5%
Student Enrollment for 1998-1999	Small	7.0%	32.6%	34.4%	26.0%
	Medium	11.0%	22.1%	43.1%	23.8%
	Large	18.2%	21.6%	45.3%	14.9%
Locale	Urban	13.8%	25.1%	41.0%	20.0%
	Suburban	14.7%	26.5%	38.2%	20.6%
	Rural or Small Town	6.5%	27.9%	40.5%	25.1%
Competitiveness	Few Admission Restrictions	10.9%	26.1%	40.1%	22.9%
	Moderately Demanding	8.4%	26.3%	38.9%	26.3%
	Among the More Demanding	16.0%	27.7%	41.5%	14.9%
	Very Demanding	13.3%	28.9%	42.2%	15.6%

Discussion: Approximately two-thirds, or 62%, of all institutions reported lack of specialized staff had a moderate to significant impact on their unit. Moreover, the same phenomenon that occurred with lack of funding also applies here: public/private and two-year/four-year institutions all reported lack of specialized staff affecting them about equally, yet public and two-year institutions offer more supports and services than their counterparts. Once again, the more competitive institutions reported that lack of staffing had less of an effect on their ability to serve or support SWDs.

M. Complaints from External, Non-University Sources

In an effort to discern how often complaints were lodged against institutions for failing to provide adequate services to SWDs, respondents were asked if their office/program had any complaints from external, non-university sources, and if there were complaints, from what types of agencies. Respondents were given a list of categories to choose from. The following table shows the average percentage of "Yes" responses by institutional type for each type of complaint:

TABLE 25. Complaints from External, Non-University Sources

Institutional Characteristic		Any Complaints	Office of Civil Rights	EEOC	State Agency	Court	Other
All Institutions		19.0%	17.4%	3.7%	4.5%	3.5%	5.4%
Public vs. Private	Public	23.2%	23.0%	3.8%	5.2%	3.3%	6.9%
	Private	13.0%	8.3%	3.6%	3.1%	4.7%	2.1%
Two-year vs. Four-year	Two-year	18.7%	14.2%	1.2%	4.9%	1.2%	4.5%
	Four-year	20.9%	21.1%	5.4%	4.3%	5.4%	6.0%
Student Enrollment for 1998-1999	Small	13.0%	8.3%	1.8%	2.2%	1.4%	2.2%
	Medium	16.9%	16.9%	1.1%	3.8%	2.7%	8.2%
	Large	37.2%	39.9%	10.1%	10.1%	8.8%	8.1%
Locale	Urban	24.4%	23.9%	6.1%	5.1%	5.6%	7.1%
	Suburban	15.2%	15.2%	2.3%	2.9%	4.1%	4.1%
	Rural or Small Town	19.1%	15.9%	2.4%	5.2%	2.0%	4.8%
Competitiveness	Few Admission Restrictions	19.5%	15.3%	1.4%	4.5%	1.7%	5.2%
	Moderately Demanding	20.8%	19.8%	5.2%	4.2%	5.7%	6.3%
	Among the More Demanding	21.1%	23.2%	4.2%	5.3%	4.2%	6.3%
	Very Demanding	15.2%	19.6%	10.9%	6.5%	6.5%	

Discussion: Across the nation, only 19% of institutions reported complaints against their office/program. The most frequent complaints (17%) were addressed to the Office of Civil Rights, with all other agencies or courts bringing fewer complaints. Public institutions had significantly more complaints lodged against them than private institutions. The larger the institution, the more complaints were lodged against them. Urban institutions had more complaints lodged against them than their counterparts.

N. Written Policies

Do postsecondary education programs have written policies concerning the provision of educational supports to SWDs? Are written policies more common in particular areas? Are there areas in need for written policy? Researchers wanted to clarify these and similar questions. The following table shows the average percentage, by institutional type, of those respondents who answered "Yes" to whether or not their unit or institution had written policies in the following areas:

TABLE 26. Written Policies

Institutional Characteristic		Institutional Commitment to Provide Reasonable Accommodations	Modification of Admission for Students with Disabilities	A Process for Students to Declare a Disability and Request Accommodations	Documentation to Establish the Existence of a Disability and Needed Accommodations to Assure Equal Access	Assignment of Responsibility for Determining Disability and Related Accommodations
All Institutions		86.3%	26.6%	86.8%	83.8%	77.8%
Public vs. Private	Public	90.8%	28.4%	91.2%	89.8%	82.9%
	Private	86.0%	24.9%	86.5%	80.3%	75.1%
Two-year vs. Four-year	Two-year	89.0%	26.0%	85.8%	85.0%	80.5%
	Four-year	89.4%	28.2%	92.4%	88.1%	80.5%
Student Enrollment for 1998-1999	Small	83.4%	24.5%	83.8%	76.9%	74.0%
	Medium	94.0%	27.3%	95.1%	94.0%	88.0%
	Large	96.6%	31.1%	95.3%	97.3%	87.2%
Locale	Urban	88.3%	27.4%	88.8%	85.3%	78.7%
	Suburban	91.8%	29.2%	92.4%	91.8%	85.4%
	Rural or Small Town	88.8%	25.1%	89.2%	84.9%	79.3%
Competitiveness	Few Admission Restrictions	90.3%	22.6%	88.9%	86.8%	79.9%
	Moderately Demanding	87.5%	32.8%	91.1%	86.5%	82.8%
	Among the More Demanding	89.5%	31.6%	90.5%	89.5%	78.9%
	Very Demanding	91.3%	21.7%	89.1%	84.8%	80.4%

TABLE 26. Written Polices *(Continued)*

Institutional Characteristic		Course Waivers / Substitutions	Confidentiality	Definition of Full-time Status for Students with Disabilities	A Grievance Procedure Regarding Disability Determination and/or Accommodations	Access to Technology
All Institutions		46.0%	85.5%	32.2%	71.5%	50.2%
Public vs. Private	Public	49.5%	89.3%	35.3%	78.7%	58.8%
	Private	42.0%	87.0%	29.5%	64.2%	38.3%
Two-year vs. Four-year	Two-year	43.1%	87.0%	28.5%	74.0%	58.1%
	Four-year	49.9%	89.7%	36.9%	74.3%	48.5%
Student Enrollment for 1998-1999	Small	36.5%	83.8%	28.2%	64.6%	47.7%
	Medium	49.2%	94.0%	35.0%	80.9%	53.0%
	Large	65.5%	91.9%	39.9%	85.8%	58.8%
Locale	Urban	45.7%	86.3%	35.5%	73.6%	49.7%
	Suburban	55.0%	88.3%	30.4%	72.5%	52.6%
	Rural or Small Town	43.8%	91.2%	33.5%	76.5%	54.2%
Competitiveness	Few Admission Restrictions	44.1%	89.2%	27.8%	75.7%	55.2%
	Moderately Demanding	50.5%	87.0%	38.0%	73.4%	47.9%
	Among the More Demanding	56.8%	93.7%	41.1%	72.6%	52.6%
	Very Demanding	37.0%	82.6%	34.8%	71.7%	50.0%

Discussion: Generally speaking, most of the surveyed postsecondary institutions had written policies in many of the areas relating to supports provision for SWDs, such as "a process for a student to declare a disability and request accommodations." On a few key issues, including "modification of admission for SWDs" (27%), "definition of full-time status for students with disabilities" (32%), and "course waivers/substitutions" (46%) less than half of the surveyed institutions had written policies. In another key area only 50% of survey institutions have written policy on access to assistive technology.

Overall, public institutions maintained written policies concerning the above issues more often than private institutions. Two- and four-year colleges did not differ on the number of written policies they had except in the areas of "declaring a disability and requesting accommodations," and "defining full-time status for SWDs. In these, four-year institutions had more written policies. The only area for which two-year institutions had significantly more written policies was regarding "access to technology." Coincidentally, two-year institutions across the nation offer more access to technology than four-year institutions. Generally speaking, the larger the institution, the more likely it was to have written policies in place.

O. Top Three Issues for Disability Support Coordinators (DSC)

What are the major concerns for disability support coordinators (DSCs) when conducting activities of their unit? Researchers wanted to discern any trends among the concerns of DSCs. We asked the respondents, "Which of the following would you rank as the top three issues that you believe your unit will face over the next two to three years?" Respondents were asked to rank the selections given in the following table:

TABLE 27. Top Three Issues for Disability Support Coordinators

Issues	Rank 1st	Rank 2nd	Rank 3rd
Funding	36.9%	21.2%	14.1%
Commitment of Top Administrators	12.3%	10.9%	9.0%
Faculty Support	2.9%	7.2%	11.9%
Technology	19.3%	18.8%	16.1%
Number of Professional Support Staff	9.7%	16.3%	16.2%
Availability of Staff with Specialized Training	10.2%	14.4%	15.6%
Physical Accessibility	4.9%	7.8%	9.5%
Compliance with Federal Requirements	1.3%	1.8%	4.9%
Other	2.4%	1.5%	2.7%

Discussion: Clearly, funding is the main concern of DSCs as they seek to implement their roles. Technology was ranked second, and commitment of top administrators was third. Interestingly, compliance with federal requirements was the last thing on the minds of DSCs, although many institutions are not complying with federal requirements when offering support for SWDs.

SECTION IV

SUMMARY

This Technical Report shares the results of a national survey conducted by the National Center for the Study of Postsecondary Educational Supports at the University of Hawai`i at Manoa. The survey sought to ascertain the types and frequency of educational supports offered to students with disabilities in postsecondary programs. The survey was distributed to a nationally representative sample of postsecondary institutions with Disability Support Coordinators serving as the primary respondents. A number of secondary analyses were conducted and reported for public/private institutions, two-year/four-year institutions, and different size institutions, institutions with different admission standards, and type of locale of institution.

Data from the national survey indicate that postsecondary institutions are providing a significant range of educational supports to students with disabilities. Those supports offered most often were the more commonly recognized services, such as test accommodations, note takers, counseling, and advocacy assistance. Areas of interest and need to students with disabilities which were not offered often included assistance with the transfer of supports to subsequent employment, assistive technology assistance, accessible transport on campus, and on-line instruction and other computer based learning opportunities.

Secondary data analysis provided a breakout of educational support offerings within different types of postsecondary institutions. On an average, public postsecondary institutions offered a greater range of educational supports to students with disabilities than private institutions. Also, on average, two-year institutions offered a greater range of educational supports to students with disabilities than four-year institutions.

The intent of this *Technical Report* has been to share the primary findings of the national survey without extensive commentary focused on interpretation of the data. Per the Participatory Action Research (PAR) process applied within the National Center for the Study of Postsecondary Educational Supports, all findings are being further reviewed within PAR teams made up of students with disabilities and other researchers. PAR teams generate implications and further meaning from the data yielding recommendations in the areas of policy, procedure, and practice, as well as questions for further research study. Further, the output from PAR teams is shared through a series of *Findings Briefs*, other reporting documents, and professional papers prepared for research journals and documents accessed by other audiences. To obtain pre-publication copies of these documents please contact Juana Tabali Weir at juana@hawaii.edu or view the Center web site at www.rrtc.hawaii.edu.

APPENDIX A

DEMOGRAPHICS (IPEDS)

IPEDS is broken out by the following regions and states:

Region 1 - **New England** states include: Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, and Vermont.

Region 2 - **Mid East** states include: Delaware, Maryland, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, and Washington D.C.

Region 3 - **Great Lakes** states include: Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Ohio, and Wisconsin

Region 4 - **Plains** states Include: Iowa, Kansas, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, and South Dakota

Region 5 - **Southeast** states include: Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, Virginia, ar West Virginia

Region 6 - **Southwest** states include: Arizona, New Mexico, Oklahoma, and Texas

Region 7 - **Rocky Mountains** states include: Colorado, Idaho, Montana, Utah, and Wyoming

Region 8 - **Far West** states include: Alaska, California, Hawaii, Nevada, Oregon, and Washington

Schools in each region are broken out into the following sectors:

Sector 1 – **Public, four-year** and above

Sector 2 - **Private, non-profit four-year** and above

Sector 3 – **Private, for-profit four-year** and above

Sector 4 - **Public two-year**

Sector 5 - **Private,** non-profit two-year

Sector 6 – **Private,** for-profit two-year

Sector 7 – **Public,** less than two-year

Sector 8 - **Private,** non-profit less than two-year

Sector 9 - **Private,** for-profit less than two-year

APPENDIX B

METHODOLOGY

Survey Instrument

A national survey instrument was developed and distributed to a national sample of more than 1500 disability support coordinators (DSC). The survey was voluntary, and individual responses were treated with strict confidentiality. Respondents were informed that their participation could have an impact on future national policy and practice. In an effort to ensure an acceptable response rate, all participants were informed that a drawing would be held for participants who completed the entire questionnaire. The winner would receive an all-expense paid trip to Hawaii for the Annual Pac-Rim Conference in March 2000. The survey yielded a 45% response rate, of which more than 650 respondents completed the survey providing a profile of characteristics

Survey Content

Survey question content was developed around the above study questions by a joint working group of consortium members (each member providing their own expertise). The questions generated in this step of survey development were constructed into a pilot study that was conducted in the state of Hawaii in order to receive feedback regarding question content and clarification, and suggestions for addition and removal items. From the pilot study feedback an 8-page survey that on average would take 45 minutes for the respondent to complete. Question content was developed around clusters of the following topics:

- Institution's capacity to offer supports or accommodations
- Number of students who receive support and disability type
- Availability of technological assistance
- Outreach programs
- Funding and specialized staff issues that affect students with disabilities
- Written policies
- Information about the respondent

Survey Distribution

The survey was distributed throughout the nation via two methods of selection of institutions. The first method involved a long-standing partnering organization, the Association for Higher Education and Disabilities (AHEAD). The AHEAD membership list is composed of Disability Support Coordinators of both public and private schools, comprised of two-year and four-year institutions. E-mail was sent to all AHEAD members informing them of the survey and the website where they could log on to complete the survey. In addition, 750 hard copies of the survey were mailed out in December 1999 to randomly selected AHEAD members to ensure access to survey. Additional copies (47) were sent out to any members who contacted us and requested a hard copy.

To address any bias issues regarding participant selection, a second institution list of non-AHEAD participants was generated from a randomized, regionally stratified list of institutions that represented less than two-year, two-year, four-year and professional schools, including both public and private sectors.

STRATIFICATION OF POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION PROGRAMS BY TYPE

The list of non-AHEAD schools was selected from the 1995 Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS) CD ROM database, maintained by the National Center for Educational Statistics (NCES), U.S. Department of Education.

The IPEDS sampling frame includes data on some 3,000 primary providers (institutions) of postsecondary education. It is the core postsecondary education data collection program of the U.S. Department of Education. It was designed by NCES to meet its mandate to report national statistics on the condition of postsecondary education in the United States. It is a single, comprehensive data collection system developed to encompass all institutions and organizations that provide postsecondary education as their primary goal. The IPEDS system is built to collect institution-level data in such areas as enrollment, program completions, faculty and staff, and financing. The IPEDS95 CD-ROM DISC is the sixth in a series, which represents the most up to date information available today.

The IPED data set is divided into eight geographic regions stratified by instructional level (four-year, two-year, less than two-year) and three sectors comprised of public, private non-profit, and private for-profit (Appendix A). Within each level of strata, (public, private, four-year, two-year, less than two-year, and region) a random sampling process was utilized to choose 750 institutions from the IPEDS sampling frame that ensured each region and sector was equally weighted with respect to each given type of school in any given state. After schools were selected, special minority schools few in number were added to the list to ensure access to survey (i.e., 15 historically black institutions and 15 Native American institutions), for a total of 780 institutions that were selected from the IPEDS sampling frame. Hard copies of the survey were mailed to these institutions during December 1999.

Sample and Response Rates

The sample for this survey consisted of a combination of more than 1500 institutions derived from AHEAD and IPEDS institutions. In December 1999, questionnaires such as the **QUESTIONNAIRE*: SAMPLE SURVEY INSTRUMENT*** located at the end of this report, were mailed to Disability Support Coordinators. Coordinators were told that the person or office at the institution most knowledgeable about students with disabilities, and the services and accommodations to these students by the institution should complete the survey.

Thirty-five institutions from the IPEDS database were found to be out of the scope of the survey because they had either closed, or moved locations and the forwarding order had expired for their current address, leaving 715 eligible institutions from the IPEDS database. Schools that had closed or moved locations tended to be less than two-year schools (e.g., real estate schools, culinary schools, employment training, biblical studies schools, or court reporting institutes). Eight schools from the AHEAD database that were mailed hard copies

were returned because of insufficient addresses, leaving 742 eligible institutions, plus the 47 additional surveys mailed out upon request by AHEAD members, for a combined total of 1,504 eligible institutions that received mailed copies of the survey.

Respondents were comprised of 465 AHEAD members and 184 non-AHEAD members. The respondents within the sample were profiled as follows: 422 were from public schools vs. 193 from private schools; 246 were from two-year or less than two-year schools vs. 369 from four-year schools.

SAMPLING AND NON-SAMPLING ERRORS

The statistics in this report are estimates from a sample. Two broad categories occur in such estimates: sampling and non-sampling errors. Sampling errors occur because observations are made only on samples of disability support coordinators, not on entire populations. Non-sampling errors occur not only in sample surveys but also in complete censuses of entire populations. Non-sampling errors can be attributed to a number of sources: inability to obtain complete information about all supports and accommodations in all institutions in the sample (partially completed surveys); ambiguous definitions; differences in interpreting questions; inability or unwillingness to give correct information; mistakes in recording or coding data; and other errors of collecting, processing, sampling, an imputing missing data.

To minimize the potential for non-sampling errors, the survey was pre-tested with respondents at institutions in the State of Hawaii like those that completed the survey nationally. During the design of the survey and the survey pilot test, an effort was made to check for consistency of interpretation of questions and to eliminate ambiguous items. Respondents had the option of completing the survey on the website where the data was automatically entered into the data file, or they mailed to the center a hard copy where the data was entered into the data file manually. To check for accuracy and consistency of manually entered data, 65 surveys that were manually entered were randomly selected and checked for accuracy of data entry as compared to information respondents filled out on hard copies. Data were entered with 100 percent accuracy.

Data Analysis System

The estimates presented in this report were produced using SPSS Data Analysis System (DAS). Descriptive analysis was performed on each survey question to obtain frequency counts or means of the general data. Further analyses to determine statistical significance between groups of question items were calculated using such tests as Chi-square and ANOVA. For example, the Chi square test was performed for questions with categorical data (Yes/No) to compare different types of institutions such as public versus private; two-year versus four-year colleges on their support services provisions. For questions with scale or ordinal data (i.e., ordinal 0-4, or scaled fill in the blank responses) and questions composed of several sub-questions, one-way ANOVA analysis was performed to compare the average means among groups. For example in question 1r, which has 6 sub-questions that pertain to technology, the questions were totaled and an average mean was determined for each group (i.e., public or private) for comparison.

LIST OF TABLES

C-1. Summer Orientation Programs for Students with Disabilities /49
C-2. Priority Registration/Course Scheduling / 50
C-3. Class Relocation / 51
C-4. Testing Accommodations / 52
C-5. Disability-Specific Scholarships / 53
C-6. Disability-Specific Assessment/Evaluation / 54
C-7. Advocacy / 55
C-8. Supports for Study Abroad / 56
C-9. Learning Center Laboratory / 57
C-10. Special Learning Strategies / 58
C-11. Developmental / Remedial Instruction / 59
C-12. Personal Counseling / 60
C-13. Accessible Transport on Campus / 61
C-14. Interpreter / Transliterator / 62
C-15. Note Takers / Scribes / Readers / 63
C-16. Tutors / 64
C-17. Real-Time Captioning / 65
C-18. Assistive Technology Evaluations for Students / 66
C-19. Skills Training on Equipment/Software / 67
C-20. Equipment or Software Provision (Loan/Lease/Purchase) / 68
C-21. AT Supports across Campus / 69
C-22. Adaptive Furniture / 70
C-23. Document Conversion / 71
C-24. Communication Skills / 72
C-25. Study Skills / 73
C-26. Memory Skills / 74
C-27. Meta-Cognitive Strategies / 75
C-28. Organizational and Time Management Skills / 76
C-29. Self-Advocacy Skills / 77
C-30. Career/Vocational Assessment and Counseling / 78
C-31. Work Experience or Work-Study Opportunities / 79
C-32. Internships/Externships / 80
C-33. Job Placement Services / 81
C-34. Facilitate Transfer of Supports to the Work Setting / 82

TABLE C-1. Summer Orientation Programs for Students with Disabilities

Institutional Characteristic		Not Offered	Offered Less Than 25% of the Time	Offered 25% to 50% of the Time	Offered 51% to 75% of the Time	Offered More Than 75% of the Time
Public vs. Private	Public	52.8%	11.6%	3.1%	4.5%	28.0%
	Private	65.8%	4.7%	2.6%	2.6%	24.4%
Two-year vs. Four-year	Two-year	57.3%	11.0%	2.8%	3.7%	25.2%
	Four -year	56.6%	8.4%	3.0%	4.1%	27.9%
Student Enrollment for 1998-1999	Small	66.1%	6.1%	2.5%	3.6%	21.7%
	Medium	55.7%	11.5%	2.2%	3.3%	27.3%
	Large	41.2%	12.8%	4.7%	4.7%	36.5%
Local	Urban	50.3%	9.1%	4.6%	2.5%	33.5%
	Suburban	60.8%	9.4%	2.3%	4.7%	22.8%
	Rural or Small Town	60.2%	9.6%	2.0%	4.0%	24.3%
Competitiveness	Few Admission Restrictions	58.0%	10.8%	1.7%	4.9%	24.7%
	Moderately Demanding	55.7%	8.3%	4.7%	2.1%	29.2%
	Among the More Demanding	53.7%	6.3%	3.2%	5.3%	31.6%
	Very Demanding	65.2%	10.9%	2.2%	2.2%	19.6%

Discussion: Public, large-size, urban, moderately demanding schools offered more summer orientation programs.

65

66

TABLE C-2. Priority Registration/Course Scheduling

Institutional Characteristic		Not Offered	Offered Less Than 25% of the Time	Offered 25% to 50% of the Time	Offered 51% to 75% of the Time	Offered More Than 75% of the Time
Public vs. Private	Public	18.7%	10.2%	4.7%	5.5%	60.9%
	Private	31.1%	15.0%	6.2%	6.7%	40.9%
Two-year vs. Four-year	Two-year	24.8%	11.0%	4.9%	6.1%	53.3%
	Four-year	21.1%	12.2%	5.4%	5.7%	55.6%
Student Enrollment for 1998-1999	Small	32.9%	15.5%	5.8%	5.1%	40.8%
	Medium	17.5%	9.3%	5.5%	8.2%	59.6%
	Large	7.4%	8.8%	4.1%	4.1%	75.7%
Locale	Urban	24.4%	8.6%	4.6%	5.6%	56.9%
	Suburban	20.5%	10.5%	4.7%	5.8%	58.5%
	Rural or Small Town	21.9%	15.1%	6.0%	6.0%	51.0%
Competitiveness	Few Admission Restrictions	23.3%	12.5%	4.5%	5.2%	54.5%
	Moderately Demanding	18.8%	13.0%	4.2%	5.7%	58.3%
	Among the More Demanding	22.1%	8.4%	7.4%	7.4%	54.7%
	Very Demanding	32.6%	8.7%	8.7%	6.5%	43.5%

Discussion: Public, large-size, moderately demanding schools offered more priority registration/course scheduling.

TABLE C-3. Class Relocation

Institutional Characteristic		Not Offered	Offered Less Than 25% of the Time	Offered 25% to 50% of the Time	Offered 51% to 75% of the Time	Offered More Than 75% of the Time
Public vs. Private	Public	12.8%	16.1%	6.6%	11.8%	52.6%
	Private	19.2%	11.4%	4.1%	10.4%	54.9%
Two-year vs. Four-year	Two-year	20.3%	19.1%	8.1%	13.0%	39.4%
	Four -year	11.1%	11.7%	4.3%	10.3%	62.6%
Student Enrollment for 1998-1999	Small	21.7%	16.6%	6.5%	10.8%	44.4%
	Medium	11.5%	13.1%	4.9%	10.4%	60.1%
	Large	4.1%	14.2%	6.1%	12.2%	63.5%
Locale	Urban	11.7%	14.2%	5.1%	14.2%	54.8%
	Suburban	14.0%	16.4%	8.8%	10.5%	50.3%
	Rural or Small Town	17.1%	14.3%	4.4%	9.6%	54.6%
Competitiveness	Few Admission Restrictions	16.0%	18.8%	5.6%	12.2%	47.6%
	Moderately Demanding	11.5%	10.4%	7.8%	9.9%	60.4%
	Among the More Demanding	15.8%	9.5%	3.2%	11.6%	60.0%
	Very Demanding	17.4%	19.6%	4.3%	10.9%	47.8%

Discussion: Large-size, four-year schools offered more class relocation support.

TABLE C-4. Testing Accommodations

Institutional Characteristic		Not Offered	Offered Less Than 25% of the Time	Offered 25% to 50% of the Time	Offered 51% to 75% of the Time	Offered More Than 75% of the Time
Public vs. Private	Public	.9%	3.6%	1.9%	5.7%	87.9%
	Private	5.7%	3.6%	1.6%	7.8%	81.3%
Two-year vs. Four-year	Two-year	2.4%	4.5%	2.0%	6.9%	84.1%
	Four-year	2.4%	3.0%	1.6%	6.0%	87.0%
Student Enrollment for 1998-1999	Small	4.0%	5.8%	2.2%	10.8%	77.3%
	Medium	.5%	1.6%	2.2%	2.7%	92.9%
	Large	.7%	2.0%	.7%	2.0%	94.6%
Locale	Urban	3.6%	4.1%	1.0%	7.6%	83.8%
	Suburban	2.9%	2.3%	2.3%	2.9%	89.5%
	Rural or Small Town	.8%	4.0%	2.0%	7.6%	85.7%
Competitiveness	Few Admission Restrictions	.7%	4.5%	2.4%	6.6%	85.8%
	Moderately Demanding	2.6%	1.0%	1.6%	4.2%	90.6%
	Among the More Demanding	5.3%	5.3%		6.3%	83.2%
	Very Demanding	6.5%	4.3%	2.2%	13.0%	73.9%

Discussion: Offered across all types of institutions, with large-size, public schools offering slightly more testing accommodations.

TABLE C-5. Disability-Specific Scholarships

Institutional Characteristic		Not Offered	Offered Less Than 25% of the Time	Offered 25% to 50% of the Time	Offered 51% to 75% of the Time	Offered More Than 75% of the Time
Public vs. Private	Public	50.7%	25.1%	7.6%	4.5%	12.1%
	Private	75.6%	11.9%	5.2%	2.1%	5.2%
Two-year vs. Four-year	Two-year	58.9%	18.7%	6.5%	4.9%	11.0%
	Four-year	58.3%	22.5%	7.0%	3.0%	9.2%
Student Enrollment for 1998-1999	Small	72.6%	15.2%	3.2%	4.0%	5.1%
	Medium	56.8%	22.4%	9.3%	2.7%	8.7%
	Large	33.1%	30.4%	11.5%	4.7%	20.3%
Locale	Urban	50.3%	20.8%	11.2%	4.6%	13.2%
	Suburban	59.6%	21.6%	8.2%	2.9%	7.6%
	Rural or Small Town	64.1%	20.3%	2.8%	4.0%	8.8%
Competitiveness	Few Admission Restrictions	57.6%	23.3%	5.9%	3.8%	9.4%
	Moderately Demanding	55.7%	22.4%	7.8%	3.6%	10.4%
	Among the More Demanding	63.2%	13.7%	8.4%	4.2%	10.5%
	Very Demanding	65.2%	15.2%	6.5%	4.3%	8.7%

Discussion: Public, large-size, urban schools offered more disability-specific scholarships.

TABLE C-6. Disability-Specific Assessment/Evaluation

Institutional Characteristic		Not Offered	Offered Less Than 25% of the Time	Offered 25% to 50% of the Time	Offered 51% to 75% of the Time	Offered More Than 75% of the Time
Public vs. Private	Public	48.3%	12.8%	6.6%	7.3%	24.9%
	Private	63.7%	8.8%	6.2%	6.2%	15.0%
Two-year vs. Four-year	Two-year	48.0%	11.8%	6.5%	8.5%	25.2%
	Four-year	56.6%	11.4%	6.5%	6.0%	19.5%
Student Enrollment for 1998-1999	Small	56.3%	13.4%	6.9%	6.5%	17.0%
	Medium	57.4%	10.4%	3.8%	6.0%	22.4%
	Large	39.9%	10.1%	8.8%	9.5%	31.8%
Locale	Urban	47.2%	9.6%	5.6%	8.6%	28.9%
	Suburban	56.1%	11.1%	4.7%	6.4%	21.6%
	Rural or Small Town	55.8%	13.5%	8.0%	6.0%	16.7%
Competitiveness	Few Admission Restrictions	52.8%	10.8%	6.9%	7.3%	22.2%
	Moderately Demanding	54.7%	11.5%	5.7%	3.1%	25.0%
	Among the More Demanding	53.7%	9.5%	6.3%	10.5%	20.0%
	Very Demanding	47.8%	21.7%	6.5%	13.0%	10.9%

Discussion: Public, two-year, large-size, urban schools offered more disability-specific assessment /evaluations.

75

76

TABLE C-7. Advocacy

Institutional Characteristic		Not Offered	Offered Less Than 25% of the Time	Offered 25% to 50% of the Time	Offered 51% to 75% of the Time	Offered More Than 75% of the Time
Public vs. Private	Public	6.6%	5.2%	5.5%	11.1%	71.6%
	Private	9.8%	7.8%	5.2%	11.9%	65.3%
Two-year vs. Four-year	Two-year	10.2%	7.3%	6.1%	11.8%	64.6%
	Four-year	6.0%	5.1%	4.9%	11.1%	72.9%
Student Enrollment for 1998-1999	Small	12.3%	9.0%	5.1%	14.4%	59.2%
	Medium	4.9%	4.9%	4.9%	6.6%	78.7%
	Large		2.0%	6.8%	10.1%	81.1%
Locale	Urban	7.1%	4.6%	3.0%	10.2%	75.1%
	Suburban	7.6%	6.4%	4.1%	10.5%	71.3%
	Rural or Small Town	7.6%	6.8%	8.0%	12.7%	64.9%
Competitiveness	Few Admission Restrictions	8.3%	6.6%	5.2%	13.9%	66.0%
	Moderately Demanding	7.3%	3.6%	7.8%	7.8%	73.4%
	Among the More Demanding	7.4%	4.2%		13.7%	74.7%
	Very Demanding	4.3%	15.2%	6.5%	4.3%	69.6%

Discussion: Public, four-year, large-size schools offered more advocacy support.

TABLE C-8. Supports for Study Abroad

Institutional Characteristic		Not Offered	Offered Less Than 25% of the Time	Offered 25% to 50% of the Time	Offered 51% to 75% of the Time	Offered More Than 75% of the Time
Public vs. Private	Public	64.9%	14.9%	3.6%	4.3%	12.3%
	Private	56.0%	15.0%	6.2%	4.7%	18.1%
Two-year vs. Four-year	Two-year	82.9%	7.3%	2.0%	2.4%	5.3%
	Four-year	48.2%	20.1%	6.0%	5.7%	20.1%
Student Enrollment for 1998-1999	Small	71.8%	11.2%	2.9%	3.2%	10.8%
	Medium	62.3%	16.4%	2.2%	3.3%	15.8%
	Large	42.6%	20.9%	10.1%	7.4%	18.9%
Locale	Urban	61.9%	13.2%	6.6%	5.1%	13.2%
	Suburban	57.9%	16.4%	4.1%	4.7%	17.0%
	Rural or Small Town	64.5%	15.9%	2.8%	3.6%	13.1%
Competitiveness	Few Admission Restrictions	80.6%	9.4%	2.1%	2.1%	5.9%
	Moderately Demanding	53.6%	20.3%	3.6%	6.3%	16.1%
	Among the More Demanding	37.9%	17.9%	8.4%	5.3%	30.5%
	Very Demanding	30.4%	23.9%	13.0%	8.7%	23.9%

Discussion: Private, four-year schools that are among the more demanding offered more supports for study abroad.

TABLE C-9. Learning Center Laboratory

Institutional Characteristic		Not Offered	Offered Less Than 25% of the Time	Offered 25% to 50% of the Time	Offered 51% to 75% of the Time	Offered More Than 75% of the Time
Public vs. Private	Public	19.7%	5.0%	8.8%	11.4%	55.2%
	Private	37.3%	5.2%	5.7%	6.7%	45.1%
Two-year vs. Four-year	Two-year	16.7%	5.3%	5.7%	10.6%	61.8%
	Four-year	30.9%	4.9%	9.2%	9.5%	45.5%
Student Enrollment for 1998-1999	Small	28.9%	5.4%	6.9%	9.7%	49.1%
	Medium	20.2%	3.3%	7.1%	12.0%	57.4%
	Large	25.0%	6.8%	10.8%	7.4%	50.0%
Locale	Urban	29.9%	4.1%	8.1%	7.1%	50.8%
	Suburban	26.3%	5.3%	5.8%	15.2%	47.4%
	Rural or Small Town	20.7%	5.6%	8.8%	8.4%	56.6%
Competitiveness	Few Admission Restrictions	16.7%	4.9%	6.9%	9.7%	61.8%
	Moderately Demanding	30.2%	5.7%	8.3%	7.8%	47.9%
	Among the More Demanding	38.9%	4.2%	10.5%	8.4%	37.9%
	Very Demanding	32.6%	4.3%	4.3%	21.7%	37.0%

Discussion: Public, two-year, medium-size, rural or small town schools with few admission restrictions offered more learning center laboratories.

TABLE C-10. Special Learning Strategies

Institutional Characteristic		Not Offered	Offered Less Than 25% of the Time	Offered 25% to 50% of the Time	Offered 51% to 75% of the Time	Offered More Than 75% of the Time
Public vs. Private	Public	9.2%	12.1%	16.6%	15.4%	46.7%
	Private	15.5%	8.8%	13.5%	17.1%	45.1%
Two-year vs. Four-year	Two-year	11.8%	10.2%	18.3%	17.1%	42.7%
	Four-year	10.8%	11.7%	13.8%	15.2%	48.5%
Student Enrollment for 1998-1999	Small	14.4%	8.7%	17.7%	17.0%	42.2%
	Medium	9.8%	13.7%	14.8%	13.1%	48.6%
	Large	6.1%	12.2%	12.2%	17.6%	52.0%
Locale	Urban	12.7%	8.1%	12.2%	17.3%	49.7%
	Suburban	9.4%	11.1%	19.3%	19.3%	40.9%
	Rural or Small Town	11.6%	12.7%	15.5%	12.4%	47.8%
Competitiveness	Few Admission Restrictions	10.4%	11.8%	17.0%	14.2%	46.5%
	Moderately Demanding	13.0%	10.9%	17.2%	13.5%	45.3%
	Among the More Demanding	11.6%	9.5%	8.4%	18.9%	51.6%
	Very Demanding	8.7%	8.7%	13.0%	28.3%	41.3%

Discussion: Offered equally at public/private, two-year/four-year, with large-size and among the more demanding schools doing slightly better

TABLE C-11. Developmental/Remedial Instruction

Institutional Characteristic		Not Offered	Offered Less Than 25% of the Time	Offered 25% to 50% of the Time	Offered 51% to 75% of the Time	Offered More Than 75% of the Time
Public vs. Private	Public	17.1%	9.2%	7.8%	9.2%	56.6%
	Private	45.6%	11.9%	7.3%	7.8%	27.5%
Two-year vs. Four-year	Two-year	5.7%	5.7%	7.7%	10.2%	70.7%
	Four-year	39.6%	13.0%	7.6%	7.9%	32.0%
Student Enrollment for 1998-1999	Small	28.2%	10.1%	9.7%	9.4%	42.6%
	Medium	22.4%	9.8%	6.6%	7.7%	53.6%
	Large	25.7%	10.8%	5.4%	8.8%	49.3%
Locale	Urban	29.4%	11.2%	7.1%	9.6%	42.6%
	Suburban	31.6%	8.8%	8.8%	5.8%	45.0%
	Rural or Small Town	19.1%	10.0%	7.6%	10.0%	53.4%
Competitiveness	Few Admission Restrictions	8.3%	5.6%	5.9%	10.8%	69.4%
	Moderately Demanding	32.3%	15.1%	10.9%	7.8%	33.9%
	Among the More Demanding	42.1%	13.7%	8.4%	7.4%	28.4%
	Very Demanding	78.3%	8.7%	4.3%	2.2%	6.5%

Discussion: Public, Two-year schools with few admissions offered much more developmental /remedial instruction.

TABLE C-12. Personal Counseling

Institutional Characteristic		Not Offered	Offered Less Than 25% of the Time	Offered 25% to 50% of the Time	Offered 51% to 75% of the Time	Offered More Than 75% of the Time
Public vs. Private	Public	4.7%	5.5%	8.8%	10.7%	70.4%
	Private	5.2%	5.2%	8.8%	10.9%	69.9%
Two-year vs. Four-year	Two-year	4.9%	5.7%	9.8%	11.8%	67.9%
	Four-year	4.9%	5.1%	8.1%	10.0%	71.8%
Student Enrollment for 1998-1999	Small	5.1%	6.5%	9.4%	12.3%	66.8%
	Medium	3.8%	5.5%	8.2%	9.8%	72.7%
	Large	4.7%	3.4%	8.1%	10.8%	73.0%
Locale	Urban	4.1%	6.1%	8.1%	10.2%	71.6%
	Suburban	5.8%	7.0%	7.6%	8.2%	71.3%.
	Rural or Small Town	4.4%	3.6%	10.0%	13.5%	68.5%
Competitiveness	Few Admission Restrictions	5.9%	6.3%	9.7%	12.5%	65.6%
	Moderately Demanding	5.2%	3.6%	10.4%	8.9%	71.9%
	Among the More Demanding	3.2%	4.2%	3.2%	8.4%	81.1%
	Very Demanding	2.2%	8.7%	6.5%	15.2%	67.4%

Discussion: Offered equally across all types of institutions. Instructions that were among the more demanding offered personal counseling even more so.

TABLE C-13. Accessible Transport on Campus

Institutional Characteristic		Not Offered	Offered Less Than 25% of the Time	Offered 25% to 50% of the Time	Offered 51% to 75% of the Time	Offered More Than 75% of the Time
Public vs. Private	Public	55.7%	6.2%	5.2%	4.5%	28.4%
	Private	58.0%	7.3%	3.1%	6.7%	24.9%
Two-year vs. Four-year	Two-year	65.9%	4.5%	5.7%	3.7%	20.3%
	Four-year	50.1%	7.9%	3.8%	6.2%	32.0%
Student Enrollment for 1998-1999	Small	67.1%	7.9%	3.6%	3.2%	18.1%
	Medium	56.3%	7.1%	4.4%	4.9%	27.3%
	Large	35.8%	3.4%	6.1%	8.8%	45.9%
Locale	Urban	52.3%	6.6%	5.1%	7.1%	28.9%
	Suburban	55.6%	7.6%	2.9%	5.8%	28.1%
	Rural or Small Town	60.6%	5.6%	5.2%	3.2%	25.5%
Competitiveness	Few Admission Restrictions	66.3%	4.5%	4.9%	5.2%	19.1%
	Moderately Demanding	54.7%	8.3%	3.1%	5.2%	28.6%
	Among the More Demanding	40.0%	5.3%	6.3%	6.3%	42.1%
	Very Demanding	37.0%	13.0%	4.3%	2.2%	43.5%

Discussion: More than half of the schools didn't offer support. Four-year, large-size schools offered it more. The more demanding the school, the more it offered accessible transport on campus.

TABLE C-14. Interpreter / Transliterator

Institutional Characteristic		Not Offered	Offered Less Than 25% of the Time	Offered 25% to 50% of the Time	Offered 51% to 75% of the Time	Offered More Than 75% of the Time
Public vs. Private	Public	10.7%	10.9%	6.2%	6.6%	65.6%
	Private	34.2%	12.4%	4.7%	6.7%	42.0%
Two-year vs. Four-year	Two-year	14.2%	10.2%	5.7%	6.1%	63.8%
	Four-year	20.6%	12.2%	5.7%	7.0%	54.5%
Student Enrollment for 1998-1999	Small	31.4%	16.2%	6.9%	6.5%	39.0%
	Medium	9.3%	9.8%	4.9%	10.9%	65.0%
	Large	2.7%	5.4%	4.1%	2.0%	85.8%
Locale	Urban	15.7%	7.1%	2.5%	7.1%	67.5%
	Suburban	19.3%	9.4%	4.7%	7.0%	59.6%
	Rural or Small Town	18.7%	16.3%	8.4%	6.0%	50.6%
Competitiveness	Few Admission Restrictions	14.2%	11.1%	5.2%	7.3%	62.2%
	Moderately Demanding	21.4%	13.0%	6.3%	6.8%	52.6%
	Among the More Demanding	20.0%	9.5%	6.3%	7.4%	56.8%
	Very Demanding	21.7%	10.9%	4.3%		63.0%

Discussion: Public, two-year, large-size schools offered more interpreters.

91

92

TABLE C-15. Note Takers / Scribes / Readers

Institutional Characteristic		Not Offered	Offered Less Than 25% of the Time	Offered 25% to 50% of the Time	Offered 51% to 75% of the Time	Offered More Than 75% of the Time
Public vs. Private	Public	5.2%	5.2%	7.3%	9.5%	72.7%
	Private	13.0%	8.3%	5.7%	12.4%	60.6%
Two-year vs. Four-year	Two-year	11.4%	6.5%	6.9%	9.3%	65.9%
	Four-year	5.1%	6.0%	6.8%	11.1%	71.0%
Student Enrollment for 1998-1999	Small	13.0%	10.5%	8.3%	11.9%	56.3%
	Medium	3.8%	2.7%	6.6%	11.5%	75.4%
	Large	.7%	3.4%	4.7%	6.8%	84.5%
Locale	Urban	8.6%	7.1%	4.1%	10.7%	69.5%
	Suburban	5.3%	4.1%	7.6%	13.5%	69.6%
	Rural or Small Town	8.0%	7.2%	8.4%	8.0%	68.5%
Competitiveness	Few Admission Restrictions	7.3%	5.6%	8.7%	9.7%	68.8%
	Moderately Demanding	6.8%	7.8%	5.7%	12.5%	67.2%
	Among the More Demanding	9.5%	5.3%	4.2%	9.5%	71.6%
	Very Demanding	8.7%	6.5%	4.3%	6.5%	73.9%

Discussion: Public, four-year, large-size schools offered more note takers.

TABLE C-16. Tutors

Institutional Characteristic		Not Offered	Offered Less Than 25% of the Time	Offered 25% to 50% of the Time	Offered 51% to 75% of the Time	Offered More Than 75% of the Time
Public vs. Private	Public	11.6%	5.2%	12.3%	15.2%	55.7%
	Private	13.0%	4.7%	7.3%	15.5%	59.6%
Two-year vs. Four-year	Two-year	9.8%	4.5%	11.4%	14.6%	59.8%
	Four-year	13.6%	5.4%	10.3%	15.7%	55.0%
Student Enrollment for 1998-1999	Small	11.2%	4.7%	9.0%	17.7%	57.4%
	Medium	10.9%	6.0%	12.0%	10.9%	60.1%
	Large	14.2%	4.7%	13.5%	16.9%	50.7%
Locale	Urban	15.2%	5.1%	10.2%	16.8%	52.8%
	Suburban	11.1%	5.8%	15.2%	14.6%	53.2%
	Rural or Small Town	9.6%	4.8%	8.4%	14.3%	62.9%
Competitiveness	Few Admission Restrictions	10.8%	6.3%	10.1%	13.9%	59.0%
	Moderately Demanding	12.5%	3.6%	13.0%	17.7%	53.1%
	Among the More Demanding	13.7%	3.2%	8.4%	15.8%	58.9%
	Very Demanding	13.0%	8.7%	10.9%	10.9%	56.5%

Discussion: Private, two-year, medium-size schools offered slightly more tutors.

TABLE C-17. Real-Time Captioning

Institutional Characteristic		Not Offered	Offered Less Than 25% of the Time	Offered 25% to 50% of the Time	Offered 51% to 75% of the Time	Offered More Than 75% of the Time
Public vs. Private	Public	66.1%	9.2%	4.3%	3.3%	17.1%
	Private	77.7%	6.7%	2.1%	2.6%	10.9%
Two-year vs. Four-year	Two-year	71.5%	8.9%	3.3%	3.3%	13.0%
	Four-year	68.6%	8.1%	3.8%	3.0%	16.5%
Student Enrollment for 1998-1999	Small	80.5%	6.9%	2.5%	2.2%	7.9%
	Medium	74.9%	8.2%	1.6%	2.7%	12.6%
	Large	42.6%	12.2%	7.4%	5.4%	32.4%
Locale	Urban	56.9%	10.2%	5.1%	4.6%	23.4%
	Suburban	71.9%	9.4%	2.9%	3.5%	12.3%
	Rural or Small Town	78.5%	6.4%	2.8%	1.6%	10.8%
Competitiveness	Few Admission Restrictions	72.9%	8.0%	3.5%	1.7%	13.9%
	Moderately Demanding	69.3%	7.8%	1.6%	5.2%	16.1%
	Among the More Demanding	63.2%	13.7%	7.4%	4.2%	11.6%
	Very Demanding	65.2%	2.2%	4.3%		28.3%

Discussion: Not offered in general, with public, large-size, urban, very demanding schools offering more real-time captioning.

TABLE C-18. Assistive Technology (AT) Evaluations for Students

Institutional Characteristic		Not Offered	Offered Less Than 25% of the Time	Offered 25% to 50% of the Time	Offered 51% to 75% of the Time	Offered More Than 75% of the Time
Public vs. Private	Public	48.6%	15.9%	8.3%	6.6%	20.6%
	Private	75.6%	10.9%	3.1%	1.6%	8.8%
Two-year vs. Four-year	Two-year	47.2%	14.6%	9.8%	7.7%	20.7%
	Four-year	63.7%	14.1%	4.6%	3.3%	14.4%
Student Enrollment for 1998-1999	Small	69.0%	11.2%	4.3%	4.0%	11.6%
	Medium	55.7%	18.0%	4.9%	5.5%	15.8%
	Large	35.1%	16.2%	13.5%	6.8%	28.4%
Locale	Urban	50.3%	13.7%	8.6%	5.1%	22.3%
	Suburban	55.6%	12.9%	6.4%	5.8%	19.3%
	Rural or Small Town	63.3%	15.9%	5.2%	4.4%	11.2%
Competitiveness	Few Admission Restrictions	52.4%	13.9%	7.6%	6.9%	19.1%
	Moderately Demanding	65.6%	10.9%	4.2%	3.1%	16.1%
	Among the More Demanding	53.7%	21.1%	9.5%	4.2%	11.6%
	Very Demanding	56.5%	17.4%	4.3%	2.2%	19.6%

Discussion: Not offered in general, with public, two-year, large-size schools offering more AT evaluations for students.

TABLE C-19. Skills Training on Equipment/Software

Institutional Characteristic		Not Offered	Offered Less Than 25% of the Time	Offered 25% to 50% of the Time	Offered 51% to 75% of the Time	Offered More Than 75% of the Time
Public vs. Private	Public	15.6%	18.2%	17.1%	12.1%	37.0%
	Private	51.3%	13.0%	8.8%	8.3%	18.7%
Two-year vs. Four-year	Two-year	19.1%	15.9%	14.6%	14.2%	36.2%
	Four-year	32.0%	17.1%	14.4%	8.7%	27.9%
Student Enrollment for 1998-1999	Small	40.4%	15.5%	10.5%	9.0%	24.5%
	Medium	20.8%	19.1%	18.6%	12.0%	29.5%
	Large	7.4%	16.2%	17.6%	12.8%	45.9%
Locale	Urban	23.9%	11.7%	18.3%	11.7%	34.5%
	Suburban	26.3%	16.4%	15.2%	11.1%	31.0%
	Rural or Small Town	29.1%	20.7%	11.2%	10.0%	29.1%
Competitiveness	Few Admission Restrictions	21.2%	17.4%	14.9%	13.5%	33.0%
	Moderately Demanding	30.7%	17.7%	13.5%	8.9%	29.2%
	Among the More Demanding	30.5%	13.7%	15.8%	10.5%	29.5%
	Very Demanding	37.0%	13.0%	13.0%	2.2%	34.8%

Discussion: Public, two-year, large-size schools offer more skills training on equipment /software.

101

102

TABLE C-20. Equipment or Software Provision (Loan/Lease/Purchase)

Institutional Characteristic		Not Offered	Offered Less Than 25% of the Time	Offered 25% to 50% of the Time	Offered 51% to 75% of the Time	Offered More Than 75% of the Time
Public vs. Private	Public	26.3%	15.6%	12.8%	14.2%	31.0%
	Private	49.7%	15.0%	8.3%	10.4%	16.6%
Two-year vs. Four-year	Two-year	26.8%	15.0%	13.0%	14.6%	30.5%
	Four-year	38.2%	15.7%	10.3%	11.9%	23.8%
Student Enrollment for 1998-1999	Small	43.3%	15.5%	10.1%	13.7%	17.3%
	Medium	30.6%	14.8%	11.5%	12.0%	31.1%
	Large	20.3%	16.9%	13.5%	13.5%	35.8%
Locale	Urban	32.5%	13.7%	10.2%	10.2%	33.5%
	Suburban	37.4%	17.5%	12.3%	12.3%	20.5%
	Rural or Small Town	32.3%	15.5%	11.6%	15.5%	25.1%
Competitiveness	Few Admission Restrictions	29.2%	14.6%	12.8%	14.6%	28.8%
	Moderately Demanding	42.7%	13.5%	7.8%	10.4%	25.5%
	Among the More Demanding	31.6%	23.2%	13.7%	13.7%	17.9%
	Very Demanding	30.4%	15.2%	10.9%	10.9%	32.6%

Discussion: Public, two-year, large-size schools offered more equipment or software provision.

TABLE C-21. AT Supports across Campus

Institutional Characteristic		Not Offered	Offered Less Than 25% of the Time	Offered 25% to 50% of the Time	Offered 51% to 75% of the Time	Offered More Than 75% of the Time
Public vs. Private	Public	13.0%	13.0%	14.5%	17.8%	41.7%
	Private	44.0%	9.8%	13.5%	9.3%	23.3%
Two-year vs. Four-year	Two-year	15.4%	13.0%	13.0%	17.5%	41.1%
	Four-year	27.6%	11.4%	14.9%	13.6%	32.5%
Student Enrollment for 1998-1999	Small	36.8%	13.7%	13.0%	11.9%	24.5%
	Medium	15.3%	13.7%	15.3%	17.5%	38.3%
	Large	4.1%	8.8%	14.9%	18.9%	53.4%
Locale	Urban	22.3%	9.6%	15.7%	13.2%	39.1%
	Suburban	26.3%	11.7%	12.3%	18.1%	31.6%
	Rural or Small Town	20.7%	14.7%	13.9%	14.3%	36.3%
Competitiveness	Few Admission Restrictions	15.6%	13.5%	13.2%	17.7%	39.9%
	Moderately Demanding	32.3%	9.9%	13.5%	12.0%	32.3%
	Among the More Demanding	27.4%	14.7%	16.8%	14.7%	26.3%
	Very Demanding	19.6%	8.7%	15.2%	10.9%	45.7%

Discussion: Public, two-year, large-size schools offered more AT supports across campus.

TABLE C-22. Adaptive Furniture

Institutional Characteristic		Not Offered	Offered Less Than 25% of the Time	Offered 25% to 50% of the Time	Offered 51% to 75% of the Time	Offered More Than 75% of the Time
Public vs. Private	Public	13.5%	13.7%	10.9%	19.7%	42.2%
	Private	38.9%	17.1%	11.4%	7.8%	24.9%
Two-year vs. Four-year	Two-year	16.3%	11.0%	11.0%	20.7%	41.1%
	Four-year	24.9%	17.3%	11.1%	12.7%	33.9%
Student Enrollment for 1998-1999	Small	35.7%	17.0%	10.5%	10.5%	26.4%
	Medium	12.6%	14.2%	10.9%	21.9%	40.4%
	Large	3.4%	12.8%	12.2%	20.3%	51.4%
Locale	Urban	19.8%	12.7%	12.7%	15.7%	39.1%
	Suburban	21.1%	12.9%	11.7%	17.5%	36.8%
	Rural or Small Town	22.7%	17.9%	9.2%	15.1%	35.1%
Competitiveness	Few Admission Restrictions	15.6%	12.8%	11.1%	19.4%	41.0%
	Moderately Demanding	26.6%	17.7%	10.4%	11.5%	33.9%
	Among the More Demanding	27.4%	16.8%	10.5%	17.9%	27.4%
	Very Demanding	23.9%	10.9%	13.0%	8.7%	43.5%

Discussion: Public, Two-year, large-size schools offered more adaptive furniture.

TABLE C-23. Document Conversion

Institutional Characteristic		Not Offered	Offered Less Than 25% of the Time	Offered 25% to 50% of the Time	Offered 51% to 75% of the Time	Offered More Than 75% of the Time
Public vs. Private	Public	23.0%	15.4%	13.3%	10.7%	37.7%
	Private	56.5%	11.4%	6.2%	7.8%	18.1%
Two-year vs. Four-year	Two-year	28.0%	15.0%	13.4%	10.6%	32.9%
	Four-year	37.1%	13.6%	9.5%	9.2%	30.6%
Student Enrollment for 1998-1999	Small	49.8%	14.4%	10.5%	6.5%	18.8%
	Medium	25.1%	14.2%	10.4%	15.3%	35.0%
	Large	12.2%	14.2%	12.2%	10.1%	51.4%
Local	Urban	30.5%	12.2%	10.7%	13.2%	33.5%
	Suburban	33.9%	14.0%	7.6%	9.9%	34.5%
	Rural or Small Town	35.5%	15.9%	13.1%	7.2%	28.3%
Competitiveness	Few Admission Restrictions	29.2%	14.2%	13.9%	10.1%	32.6%
	Moderately Demanding	38.5%	14.6%	10.4%	8.9%	27.6%
	Among the More Demanding	29.5%	15.8%	6.3%	14.7%	33.7%
	Very Demanding	45.7%	8.7%	4.3%	2.2%	39.1%

Discussion: Public, large-size schools offered more document conversion.

TABLE C-24. Communication Skills

Institutional Characteristic		Not Offered	Offered Less Than 25% of the Time	Offered 25% to 50% of the Time	Offered 51% to 75% of the Time	Offered More Than 75% of the Time
Public vs. Private	Public	21.3%	19.0%	13.5%	11.8%	34.4%
	Private	32.6%	9.8%	11.9%	9.3%	36.3%
Two-year vs. Four-year	Two-year	20.3%	16.7%	13.8%	11.8%	37.4%
	Four-year	27.9%	15.7%	12.5%	10.6%	33.3%
Student Enrollment for 1998-1999	Small	28.2%	15.2%	12.3%	9.0%	35.4%
	Medium	20.2%	15.3%	15.8%	12.6%	36.1%
	Large	23.0%	18.9%	12.2%	13.5%	32.4%
Locale	Urban	26.9%	16.2%	12.2%	11.2%	33.5%
	Suburban	28.1%	16.4%	14.6%	11.7%	29.2%
	Rural or Small Town	20.3%	15.5%	13.1%	10.4%	40.6%
Competitiveness	Few Admission Restrictions	22.6%	15.3%	14.9%	10.8%	36.5%
	Moderately Demanding	28.1%	17.2%	9.9%	9.9%	34.9%
	Among the More Demanding	23.2%	15.8%	12.6%	14.7%	33.7%
	Very Demanding	26.1%	15.2%	17.4%	8.7%	32.6%

Discussion: Offered equally across all institutional types, with rural or small town offering slightly more communication skills.

111

112

TABLE C-25. Study Skills

Institutional Characteristic		Not Offered	Offered Less Than 25% of the Time	Offered 25% to 50% of the Time	Offered 51% to 75% of the Time	Offered More Than 75% of the Time
Public vs. Private	Public	5.2%	10.0%	11.4%	13.7%	59.7%
	Private	12.4%	7.3%	6.2%	13.0%	61.1%
Two-year vs. Four-year	Two-year	6.9%	10.6%	11.4%	13.8%	57.3%
	Four-year	7.9%	8.1%	8.7%	13.3%	62.1%
Student Enrollment for 1998-1999	Small	10.5%	9.7%	8.3%	14.4%	57.0%
	Medium	4.4%	7.1%	11.5%	12.0%	65.0%
	Large	4.7%	10.8%	10.8%	12.8%	60.8%
Locale	Urban	10.2%	9.1%	8.6%	14.2%	57.9%
	Suburban	9.4%	10.5%	10.5%	14.6%	55.0%
	Rural or Small Town	4.0%	8.0%	10.0%	12.0%	66.1%
Competitiveness	Few Admission Restrictions	5.9%	10.1%	10.4%	12.8%	60.8%
	Moderately Demanding	8.3%	9.9%	8.9%	13.0%	59.9%
	Among the More Demanding	6.3%	5.3%	9.5%	15.8%	63.2%
	Very Demanding	15.2%	6.5%	10.9%	13.0%	54.3%

Discussion: Offered equally across all institution type, with rural or small town institution offering more study skills.

TABLE C-26. Memory Skills

Institutional Characteristic		Not Offered	Offered Less Than 25% of the Time	Offered 25% to 50% of the Time	Offered 51% to 75% of the Time	Offered More Than 75% of the Time
Public vs. Private	Public	18.0%	16.6%	16.6%	11.8%	37.0%
	Private	24.9%	14.5%	7.8%	11.9%	40.9%
Two-year vs. Four-year	Two-year	22.4%	16.7%	17.1%	11.0%	32.9%
	Four-year	18.7%	15.4%	11.7%	12.5%	41.7%
Student Enrollment for 1998-1999	Small	22.7%	16.2%	11.9%	12.3%	36.8%
	Medium	17.5%	14.8%	17.5%	9.8%	40.4%
	Large	16.2%	16.9%	13.5%	13.5%	39.9%
Locale	Urban	21.3%	18.3%	9.1%	13.7%	37.6%
	Suburban	20.5%	14.6%	17.5%	10.5%	36.8%
	Rural or Small Town	19.1%	14.7%	14.7%	11.2%	40.2%
Competitiveness	Few Admission Restrictions	19.8%	16.7%	16.0%	10.8%	36.8%
	Moderately Demanding	18.8%	16.7%	12.5%	9.4%	42.7%
	Among the More Demanding	17.9%	13.7%	11.6%	18.9%	37.9%
	Very Demanding	34.8%	10.9%	8.7%	13.0%	32.6%

Discussion: Four-year schools offered more memory skills training.

115

116

TABLE C-27. Meta-Cognitive Strategies

Institutional Characteristic		Not Offered	Offered Less Than 25% of the Time	Offered 25% to 50% of the Time	Offered 51% to 75% of the Time	Offered More Than 75% of the Time
Public vs. Private	Public	23.7%	17.8%	17.1%	12.1%	29.4%
	Private	29.0%	12.4%	13.5%	7.3%	37.8%
Two-year vs. Four-year	Two-year	30.1%	16.7%	17.5%	11.4%	24.4%
	Four-year	22.2%	15.7%	14.9%	10.0%	37.1%
Student Enrollment for 1998-1999	Small	28.9%	14.1%	16.6%	9.7%	30.7%
	Medium	24.0%	18.0%	14.8%	10.4%	32.8%
	Large	18.9%	18.2%	14.9%	12.8%	35.1%
Local	Urban	23.9%	16.8%	14.7%	11.2%	33.5%
	Suburban	27.5%	15.2%	18.1%	8.8%	30.4%
	Rural or Small Town	25.1%	15.9%	15.1%	11.2%	32.7%
Competitiveness	Few Admission Restrictions	26.4%	20.1%	16.7%	10.8%	26.0%
	Moderately Demanding	23.4%	14.6%	16.1%	7.8%	38.0%
	Among the More Demanding	25.3%	7.4%	13.7%	14.7%	38.9%
	Very Demanding	28.3%	13.0%	13.0%	10.9%	34.8%

Discussion: Private and four-year institutions offered more meta-cognitive strategies.

TABLE C-28. Organizational and Time Management Skills

Institutional Characteristic		Not Offered	Offered Less Than 25% of the Time	Offered 25% to 50% of the Time	Offered 51% to 75% of the Time	Offered More Than 75% of the Time
Public vs. Private	Public	7.6%	11.4%	13.5%	16.8%	50.7%
	Private	12.4%	6.7%	5.7%	16.1%	59.1%
Two-year vs. Four-year	Two-year	9.3%	11.0%	14.6%	15.4%	49.6%
	Four-year	8.9%	9.2%	8.7%	17.3%	55.8%
Student Enrollment for 1998-1999	Small	12.3%	8.3%	10.8%	17.3%	51.3%
	Medium	7.7%	10.9%	10.9%	14.8%	55.7%
	Large	4.1%	12.8%	12.2%	16.9%	54.1%
Locale	Urban	10.7%	8.6%	9.6%	20.3%	50.8%
	Suburban	11.7%	11.7%	12.3%	13.5%	50.9%
	Rural or Small Town	6.0%	10.0%	11.2%	15.1%	57.8%
Competitiveness	Few Admission Restrictions	8.3%	11.1%	13.9%	15.3%	51.4%
	Moderately Demanding	9.4%	9.4%	9.4%	16.1%	55.7%
	Among the More Demanding	8.4%	6.3%	5.3%	21.1%	58.9%
	Very Demanding	13.0%	13.0%	10.9%	15.2%	47.8%

Discussion: Private and four-year institutions offered more organizational and time management skills.

TABLE C-29. Self-Advocacy Skills

Institutional Characteristic		Not Offered	Offered Less Than 25% of the Time	Offered 25% to 50% of the Time	Offered 51% to 75% of the Time	Offered More Than 75% of the Time
Public vs. Private	Public	5.5%	5.2%	10.9%	12.1%	66.4%
	Private	16.1%	6.7%	7.8%	15.5%	53.9%
Two-year vs. Four-year	Two-year	5.7%	4.9%	8.9%	11.4%	69.1%
	Four-year	10.8%	6.2%	10.6%	14.4%	58.0%
Student Enrollment for 1998-1999	Small	13.4%	5.8%	9.4%	15.9%	55.6%
	Medium	4.9%	4.9%	10.4%	10.9%	68.9%
	Large	4.1%	6.8%	10.8%	11.5%	66.9%
Locale	Urban	10.2%	7.6%	7.1%	14.2%	60.9%
	Suburban	9.9%	5.3%	9.4%	11.1%	64.3%
	Rural or Small Town	6.4%	4.4%	12.7%	13.9%	62.5%
Competitiveness	Few Admission Restrictions	6.3%	4.5%	10.8%	12.8%	65.6%
	Moderately Demanding	6.3%	6.8%	11.5%	11.5%	64.1%
	Among the More Demanding	16.8%	8.4%	7.4%	18.9%	48.4%
	Very Demanding	17.4%	2.2%	4.3%	10.9%	65.2%

Discussion: Public, two-year, medium- and large-size schools offered more self-advocacy. Four-year, medium-and large-size, and among the more demanding schools offered more career/vocational assessment and counseling.

121

122

TABLE C-30. Career/Vocational Assessment and Counseling

Institutional Characteristic		Not Offered	Offered Less Than 25% of the Time	Offered 25% to 50% of the Time	Offered 51% to 75% of the Time	Offered More Than 75% of the Time
Public vs. Private	Public	12.1%	7.6%	13.7%	17.5%	49.1%
	Private	17.6%	7.8%	10.4%	15.5%	48.7%
Two-year vs. Four-year	Two-year	15.4%	7.7%	15.4%	17.1%	44.3%
	Four-year	12.7%	7.6%	10.8%	16.8%	52.0%
Student Enrollment for 1998-1999	Small	19.1%	8.7%	13.0%	14.1%	45.1%
	Medium	8.7%	7.7%	8.7%	20.8%	54.1%
	Large	8.1%	6.1%	16.2%	16.9%	52.7%
Locale	Urban	16.2%	5.6%	10.7%	17.8%	49.7%
	Suburban	11.7%	8.8%	11.1%	19.9%	48.5%
	Rural or Small Town	12.7%	8.4%	15.5%	13.9%	49.4%
Competitiveness	Few Admission Restrictions	12.8%	8.0%	16.3%	18.1%	44.8%
	Moderately Demanding	12.5%	7.3%	12.5%	14.1%	53.6%
	Among the More Demanding	13.7%	4.2%	6.3%	17.9%	57.9%
	Very Demanding	23.9%	13.0%	4.3%	17.4%	41.3%

TABLE C-31. Work Experience or Work-Study Opportunities

Institutional Characteristic		Not Offered	Offered Less Than 25% of the Time	Offered 25% to 50% of the Time	Offered 51% to 75% of the Time	Offered More Than 75% of the Time
Public vs. Private	Public	11.8%	14.2%	13.0%	14.7%	46.2%
	Private	16.1%	8.8%	13.0%	17.6%	44.6%
Two-year vs. Four-year	Two-year	15.4%	15.0%	12.2%	15.0%	42.3%
	Four-year	11.7%	10.8%	13.6%	16.0%	48.0%
Student Enrollment for 1998-1999	Small	15.5%	11.6%	12.6%	13.4%	46.9%
	Medium	12.6%	13.1%	14.8%	19.1%	40.4%
	Large	8.8%	14.2%	12.2%	14.9%	50.0%
Locale	Urban	14.2%	14.7%	10.7%	17.8%	42.6%
	Suburban	14.0%	11.1%	12.9%	15.2%	46.8%
	Rural or Small Town	11.6%	12.0%	15.1%	13.9%	47.4%
Competitiveness	Few Admission Restrictions	15.3%	14.2%	14.2%	16.3%	39.9%
	Moderately Demanding	9.4%	12.5%	13.0%	14.6%	50.5%
	Among the More Demanding	10.5%	11.6%	12.6%	15.8%	49.5%
	Very Demanding	19.6%	6.5%	6.5%	15.2%	52.2%

Discussion: Offered equally across all institution type, with the more demanding schools offering more work-study opportunities

TABLE C-32. Internships/Externships

Institutional Characteristic		Not Offered	Offered Less Than 25% of the Time	Offered 25% to 50% of the Time	Offered 51% to 75% of the Time	Offered More Than 75% of the Time
Public vs. Private	Public	21.1%	16.1%	15.2%	12.3%	35.3%
	Private	19.2%	7.3%	10.4%	13.0%	50.3%
Two-year vs. Four-year	Two-year	30.1%	14.6%	13.8%	12.2%	29.3%
	Four-year	14.1%	12.5%	13.6%	12.7%	47.2%
Student Enrollment for 1998-1999	Small	22.7%	10.1%	13.7%	10.5%	43.0%
	Medium	18.0%	16.9%	14.8%	16.4%	33.9%
	Large	18.9%	13.5%	11.5%	12.8%	43.2%
Local	Urban	23.4%	13.7%	9.1%	13.7%	40.1%
	Suburban	18.1%	12.9%	14.0%	9.9%	45.0%
	Rural or Small Town	19.5%	13.1%	16.7%	13.5%	37.1%
Competitiveness	Few Admission Restrictions	27.8%	18.1%	13.5%	11.8%	28.8%
	Moderately Demanding	13.5%	8.9%	14.6%	14.1%	49.0%
	Among the More Demanding	13.7%	11.6%	13.7%	9.5%	51.6%
	Very Demanding	19.6%	4.3%	8.7%	17.4%	50.0%

Discussion: Private, four-year, and the more demanding schools offered more internships /externships.

127

128

TABLE C-33. Job Placement Services

Institutional Characteristic		Not Offered	Offered Less Than 25% of the Time	Offered 25% to 50% of the Time	Offered 51% to 75% of the Time	Offered More Than 75% of the Time
Public vs. Private	Public	16.8%	11.8%	11.1%	13.7%	46.4%
	Private	24.9%	7.8%	8.3%	11.4%	47.7%
Two-year vs. Four-year	Two-year	17.1%	14.2%	8.9%	14.2%	45.5%
	Four-year	20.9%	8.1%	11.1%	12.2%	47.7%
Student Enrollment for 1998-1999	Small	21.7%	11.2%	8.3%	12.3%	46.6%
	Medium	18.6%	12.0%	12.0%	13.1%	44.3%
	Large	15.5%	7.4%	11.5%	15.5%	50.0%
Local	Urban	18.8%	9.1%	10.2%	14.7%	47.2%
	Suburban	22.2%	11.7%	11.1%	9.9%	45.0%
	Rural or Small Town	17.5%	10.8%	9.6%	13.9%	48.2%
Competitiveness	Few Admission Restrictions	18.4%	13.2%	10.8%	14.9%	42.7%
	Moderately Demanding	18.2%	7.3%	9.4%	12.0%	53.1%
	Among the More Demanding	16.8%	12.6%	12.6%	11.6%	46.3%
	Very Demanding	34.8%	4.3%	4.3%	8.7%	47.8%

Discussion: Offered equally across all institution types, with moderately demanding schools offering slightly more job placement services.

TABLE C-34. Facilitate Transfer of Supports to the Work Setting

Institutional Characteristic		Not Offered	Offered Less Than 25% of the Time	Offered 25% to 50% of the Time	Offered 51% to 75% of the Time	Offered More Than 75% of the Time
Public vs. Private	Public	47.6%	20.9%	10.9%	5.9%	14.7%
	Private	65.3%	12.4%	6.7%	4.7%	10.9%
Two-year vs. Four-year	Two-year	48.4%	22.4%	10.2%	4.5%	14.6%
	Four-year	56.4%	15.4%	9.2%	6.2%	12.7%
Student Enrollment for 1998-1999	Small	59.9%	15.2%	7.6%	6.1%	11.2%
	Medium	53.6%	20.2%	9.3%	5.5%	11.5%
	Large	41.2%	21.6%	14.2%	4.7%	18.2%
Locale	Urban	52.3%	15.2%	10.7%	4.6%	17.3%
	Suburban	54.4%	20.5%	6.4%	7.0%	11.7%
	Rural or Small Town	53.4%	18.7%	11.2%	5.2%	11.6%
Competitiveness	Few Admission Restrictions	54.9%	19.1%	9.7%	3.1%	13.2%
	Moderately Demanding	50.0%	17.2%	9.4%	9.4%	14.1%
	Among the More Demanding	52.6%	15.8%	11.6%	4.2%	15.8%
	Very Demanding	56.5%	19.6%	6.5%	6.5%	10.9%

Discussion: Generally *not* offered across all institution types, with public, large-size schools offering slightly more services.

REFERENCES

Gajar, A. (1998). Postsecondary education. In F. Rusch & J. Chadsley (Eds.). Beyond high school: Transition from school to work (pp. 383-405). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing.

National Council on Disability (2000, May 15). National disability policy: A progress report. Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved July 12, 2000 from the World Wide Web: http://www.ncd.gov/newsroom/publications/policy9899.html

National Center for Education Statistics. (1999, June). Students with disabilities in postsecondary education: a profile of preparation, participation, and outcomes. Washington, DC: United States Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement.

National Center for Education Statistics. (1999, August). An institutional perspective on students with disabilities in postsecondary education. Washington, DC: United States Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement.

National Survey of Post-secondary Educational Supports for Students with Disabilities

A Cooperative Effort of the

Association on Higher Education and Disabilities

and the

National Center for the Study of Post-secondary Educational Supports (NCSPES) at the University of Hawai`i

Supported by a grant from the
National Institute on Disability Research and Rehabilitation

This national survey about **students with disabilities at post-secondary institutions** is voluntary. However, your participation is critical in making the results of this survey accurate and comprehensive. Your responses can have an impact on national policy and practice. As a further incentive for participation, each person who completes the questionnaire will be entered into a random drawing for an expense-paid trip (air fare and lodging) to the Sixteenth Annual Pacific Rim Conference on Disabilities, March 5 - 7, 2000 in Honolulu, Hawai'i.

Assurances: Individual responses will be treated as ***strictly confidential***. Only aggregated data will be reported and precautions will be taken to prevent identification of any institution due to its unique characteristics. **Purpose:** The major purpose of this survey is to describe the nature and range of supports and accommodations in post-secondary institutions nationally. Some of the supports and accommodations listed in the items that follow are likely to be common to many institutions while others may be offered by only a few or on a pilot basis. Your candid responses are needed to make this survey accurate. **Results** of the survey will be reported in aggregate form through posting on the NCSPES web site, direct mailing to you if requested, and publication in professional journals and newsletters. **Questions?** If you want additional information about the survey before responding, you may contact either of the individuals listed at the bottom of this questionnaire.

Identity of Person Completing This Form: We hope that the individual who has overall responsibility for supports and accommodations for students with disabilities will be the one who completes this form. We have made an effort to identify in advance individuals with that responsibility. We recognize, though, that the form may be routed to someone else or, that because of the ways that services are organized, more than one person may need to respond. If you are not the person named in the cover letter, or no person was named, please provide your title / position. If you wish, you may include your name and phone number. All of your individual responses will be kept in **Strict Confidence**.

Title / Position: _____

Your name (optional): _____
Phone (optional): _____ E-mail (optional): _____

[If you believe that more than one person from your institution needs to complete a survey, please make a copy of this form and enter the identification number from the front cover of this booklet on the copy(ies).]

Web Survey Option: You are encouraged to respond to this survey via the NCSPES **web site**. To gain access to electronic questionnaire, go to the following web address:

http://www.rrtc.hawaii.edu/survey.htm

Thank you for your participation!

1. What is the **capacity** of your institution to offer the following supports or accommodations as needed by students with disabilities? If the service or accommodation is

not offered	then circle the	"0"
offered less than 25% of time	circle the	"1"
offered 25% to 50% of the time	circle the	"2"
offered 51% to 75% of the time	circle the	"3"
offered more than 75% of the time	circle the	"4"

a.	Summer orientation program(s) for students with disabilities	0 1 2 3 4
b.	Priority registration / course scheduling	0 1 2 3 4
c.	Class relocation	0 1 2 3 4
d.	Testing accommodations	0 1 2 3 4
e.	Disability-specific scholarships	0 1 2 3 4
f.	Disability-specific assessment/evaluation	0 1 2 3 4
g.	Advocacy	0 1 2 3 4
h.	Supports for study abroad	0 1 2 3 4
i.	Learning center laboratory	0 1 2 3 4
j.	Special learning strategies	0 1 2 3 4
k.	Developmental/remedial instruction	0 1 2 3 4
l.	Personal counseling	0 1 2 3 4
m.	Accessible transport on campus	0 1 2 3 4
n.	Interpreter / transliterator	0 1 2 3 4
o.	Notetakers / scribes / readers	0 1 2 3 4
p.	Tutors	0 1 2 3 4
q.	Real-time captioning	0 1 2 3 4
r.	Assistive technology (AT) supports	
	(1) Assistive technology evaluations for students	0 1 2 3 4
	(2) Skills training on equipment / software	0 1 2 3 4
	(3) Equipment or software provision (loan/lease/purchase)	0 1 2 3 4
	(4) AT supports across campus (e.g., library, computer lab)	0 1 2 3 4
	(5) Adaptive furniture	0 1 2 3 4
	(6) Document conversion	0 1 2 3 4
s.	Skills development for students —	
	(1) communication skills	0 1 2 3 4
	(2) study skills	0 1 2 3 4
	(3) memory skills (e.g., use of mnemonics)	0 1 2 3 4
	(4) meta-cognitive strategies (e.g., task analysis, self-monitoring)	0 1 2 3 4
	(5) organizational and time management skills	0 1 2 3 4
	(6) self-advocacy skills	0 1 2 3 4
t.	Career / vocational assessment and counseling	0 1 2 3 4
u.	Work experience or work-study opportunities	0 1 2 3 4
v.	Internships / externships	0 1 2 3 4
w.	Job placement services	0 1 2 3 4
x.	Facilitate transfer of supports to the work setting	0 1 2 3 4

2. Approximately how many students at your institution have a disability that qualifies them to receive support services and reasonable accommodations under the Americans with Disabilities Act (please include students with 504 plans)? _____

3. Approximately what percent of eligible students with disabilities received support services during the past academic year? _____

4. How is your institution organized to provide reasonable accommodation and support services for students with disabilities? [Fill-in all that apply]

   a. Separate, centralized unit serving students with disabilities only .... ❍
   b. Separate, centralized unit serving all persons with disabilities on campus (faculty, staff, and students) ..... ❍
   c. Decentralized services within academic departments/units ..... ❍
   d. Students with disabilities receive services from the same unit(s) as all other students ..... ❍
   e. Other (please describe) ..... ❍

   _____

   _____

5. Please estimate the % of students with disabilities served who have ...
   a. multiple disabilities ..... _____

   b. the primary presenting condition in one of the categories below:
      (1) Blind or visual impairment ..... _____
      (2) Deaf or hearing impairment ..... _____
      (3) Health impairment ..... _____
      (4) Learning disability &/or attention deficit / ADHD ..... _____
      (5) Mental health / emotional / psychological disability ..... _____
      (6) Mobility impairment ..... _____
      (7) Orthopedic disability without mobility impairment ..... _____
      (8) Speech or Language impairment ..... _____
      (9) Cognitive disability (including mental retardation) ..... _____
      (10) Acquired head injury / traumatic brain injury ..... _____
      (11) Other: (Please specify) ..... _____

      _____

6. Is a screening service offered to students to determine whether the student has a specific learning disability (previously undiagnosed)? **No** ① **Yes** ②

7. Does your institution offer	No	Yes
Distance learning access for students who are deaf or blind —		
(1) accessible on-line library services?	①	②
(2) accessible on-line student services (e.g., registration)?	①	②
(3) accessible TV courses (e.g., captioning, descriptive narration)?	①	②
(4) accessible Web-based courseware?	①	②

8. Does your institution facilitate, as needed, a student's linkages with other community resources (such as, vocational rehabilitation, transportation to / from campus)?	No	Yes
	①	②

9. Has your program reached out, with activities and/or materials, to any of the following? (Please check all that apply.)

	No	Yes
a. High school counselors or transition coordinators ?	①	②
b. Special education teachers ?	①	②
c. State vocational rehabilitation personnel ?	①	②
d Other rehabilitation professionals ?	①	②
e. Federal programs related to employment in your community ?	①	②
f. Businesses / employers ?	①	②
g. Parent / family organizations ?	①	②
h. Consumer / advocacy groups ?	①	②
i. Other? (Please specify)	①	②

_____

10. Has your institution negotiated vocational rehabilitation &/or interagency agreements for serving students with disabilities?	No	Yes
	①	②

11. Which of the following types of material or activity, if any, are offered to aid faculty / staff in working with students with disabilities?

	No	Yes
a. Faculty/staff handbook	①	②
b. Annual mailings to faculty/staff	①	②
c. Frequent workshops and/or presentations to faculty groups	①	②
d. Consultations with faculty who seek assistance or information	①	②
e. Information products (e.g., books, films, videotapes)	①	②

12. Has your program attempted to coordinate the transfer of effective supports for students to their post-graduate employment setting?		
	①	②

13. How are quality and effectiveness of services for students with disabilities monitored and evaluated? (Please check all that apply).

	No	Yes
Counts of services provided	①	②
Student satisfaction survey	①	②
Student retention rate	①	②
Student graduation rate	①	②
Faculty satisfaction survey	①	②
Faculty evaluation of workshops	①	②
Job placement rate	①	②
Alumni follow-up surveys	①	②
Other: _____	①	②

14. To what extent does lack of funding affect your unit's ability to serve students with disabilities?

	Please select one
No lack of funding	○
Very little effect	○
A moderate extent	○
A great deal	○

15. To what extent does a lack of staff with specialized skills affect your unit?

No lack of staff with specialized skills	○
Very little effect	○
A moderate extent	○
A great deal	○

16. Has your office / program had any complaints from external, non-university sources? No ① Yes ②

IF Yes, please check all that apply from the following list:

Office of Civil Rights	○
EEOC	○
State Agency	○
Court (litigation)	○
Other:	○

(Please specify below):

_____

17. Please indicate whether your unit or institution has **written policies** on any of the following (check all that apply)

	No	Yes
Institutional commitment to provide reasonable accommodations	①	②
Modification of admissions for students with disabilities	①	②
A process for a student to declare a disability and request accommodation	①	②
Documentation to establish the existence of a disability and needed accommodations to assure equal access	①	②
Assignment of responsibility for determining disability and related accommodations	①	②
Course waivers/substitutions	①	②
Confidentiality	①	②
Definition of full-time status for students with disabilities	①	②
A grievance procedure regarding disability determination and/or accommodations	①	②
Access to technology	①	②

18. Which of the following would you rank as the top **three (3)** issues that you believe your unit will face over the next two to three years?
[Enter the letter of the issue selected in the column on the right.]

a. Funding
b. Commitment of top administrators
c. Faculty support
d. Technology
e. Number of professional support staff
f. Availability of staff with specialized training
g. Physical accessibility
h. Compliance with Federal requirements
i. Other: _____

RANK

First ___
Second ___
Third ___

[If more than one write-in item, number in ranking as i-1, i-2]

19. **Approximately how many of the following types of staff are employed in your disability support services unit?**

	Part-time	Full-time
(1) professional staff	_____	_____
(2) support staff	_____	_____
(3) student staff	_____	_____
(4) volunteer staff	_____	_____

	No	Yes
20. Is there an advocacy organization on campus for students with disabilities?	①	②
If yes, does your institution support this organization with financial, advisory, or other means of support?	①	②

21. Is there representation of students with disabilities on any advisory or steering committee for your unit?

	Please select one
a. We do not have an advisory committee for our unit	○
b. We have an advisory committee but students do not serve on the committee	○
c. We have an advisory committee with students on it, but students with disabilities may or may not be on the committee	○
d. We have an advisory committee and representation of students with disabilities is required	○

22. **About you:**

a. How many years have you worked in your present position?

(1) Less than 5 years	○
(2) Five to ten years	○
(3) More than 10 years	○

b. How many years have you worked in the area of student services in a post-secondary program?

(1) Less than 5 years	○
(2) Five to ten years	○
(3) More than 10 years	○

c. In what discipline or field did you receive your training?

_____

22 **About you** (continued):

d. What is your highest degree earned?

(1) Less than a baccalaureate	❍
(2) Baccalaureate	❍
(3) Master's	❍
(4) Doctoral	❍
(5) Other: _____	❍

e. Prior to your current position, did you have experience as an

	No	Yes
(1) instructional faculty member ..... ?	①	②
(2) equal opportunity / ADA compliance officer ..... ?	①	②

23. **About Your Institution**

a. Name of your Institution? _____

b. We are interested in knowing about your type of institution; please select one of the following:

Public	Private Non-profit	Private for-Profit
❍ 4-Year/Professional	❍ 4-Year /Professional	❍ 4-Year /Professional
❍ Two-year	❍ Two-year	❍ Two-year
❍ Less than two-year	❍ Less than two-year	❍ Less than two-year

b. What was your institution's approximate total student enrollment for 1998-1999? _____

c. How competitive is the admissions standard for your institution? (Please select one of the following):

(1) Few admissions restrictions or requirements	❍
(2) Moderately demanding	❍
(3) Among the more demanding	❍
(4) Very demanding	❍

d. Is the locale of your institution

(1) urban	❍
(2) suburban	❍
(3) rural or small town	❍

Thank you very much for your support! If you have questions or comments, please call. If you would like a record of your responses, please make a copy of this form. Please use the postage-paid return envelope that was included in your packet. If you do not have that envelope, please return the completed form to:

NCSPES
Center on Disability Studies
1776 University Avenue, UA 4-6
Honolulu, Hawaii 96822

Ron James
808-956-5712
Fax: 808-956-7878
Email: rjames@hawaii.edu

Audray Holm
TTY 808-956-3975

If you would like to receive a written summary of the results of this survey and/or to be entered into the drawing for the trip to Hawai`i, please enter your name and address on **the back of the return envelope**. Do not write your name on the questionnaire if you want your individual responses to remain anonymous.

[ ] I want to be entered into the drawing

[ ] I would like to receive a written summary of survey results

Your contribution to this effort is greatly appreciated. If you would like a summary of results, please print your name and address on the back of the return envelope (NOT on this questionnaire). We will see that you get a copy.